AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. IV.—(XXIV).—MAY, 1901.—NO. 5.

SYSTEMS AND COUNTER-SYSTEMS OF EDUCATION.

(1648–1800.)

EDUCATIONAL WORKS . . . . . BARNARD.
GESCHICHTE DER PÄDAGOGIK . . . . . VON RAUMER.
LEHRBUCH DER GESCHICHTE DER PÄDAGOGIK . . . STÖCKL.

WHILE in one sense the treaty of Westphalia (1648) inaugurated a peace, in another it did but transfer the conflict between Protestantism and Catholicity from the battle-field to the class-room. No sooner was that treaty proclaimed than the work of education, so rudely and so often interrupted, was actively resumed, and the development of educational systems, which had already set in, was pushed forward on both sides with astonishing rapidity and resolution. The consideration of these systems as they come to the surface, each expressive of its own peculiar phase of thought and ideas of progress, furnishes us with the best commentary upon the educational status of the times. With Protestantism it was a strong endeavor to perpetuate, by laying siege to youthful minds and hearts, its heterogeneous theological beliefs; with the Church, a supreme effort to recover what she had lost and to strengthen and purify what she still retained. As we view the contestants, arrayed one against the other, their respective educational policies suggest a contrast fraught with the profoundest significance to the true philosopher of history. In the one, the non-Catholic, we discern the spirit of humanistic scepticism busily and variously at work paving the way, by slow degrees, for the infidelity of the French Revolution, in which it culminated and by which it was eventually supplanted. The

repudiation by the Reformers and later Humanists of scholasticism had given an undue prominence to purely inductive methods. To both they came as valuable substitutes for what they considered the meaningless vagaries of the schoolmen. Yet, for all this, it must be admitted that they were neither new nor untried. Aristotle, the early Christian philosophers, and a whole train of mediæval writers, had been more or less familiar with them long before the *Novum Organum* of Francis Bacon had made its appearance. Bacon, it is true, emphasized and popularized them. He entered, more than any of his predecessors had done, into the systematization of scientific details, and gave an impulse to the spirit of physical inquiry which has since revolutionized the world. Nevertheless, he was not their discoverer—only their chief formulator and propagator. It was not long before his overzealous disciples, pushing their advocacy of the analytic method far beyond what he contemplated, rejected as altogether useless the synthetic process, from which, in any true system of philosophy, it is necessarily inseparable. The effect was inevitable. The study of the outer world; the concentration of human intelligence and energy upon mere objective phenomena; the consequent darkening and gradual elimination of the spiritual from the horizon of scientific speculation—all contributed to lead up to the gospel of materialism, which took such an easy hold upon minds already adrift on a sea of contradictions and errors, and has not even yet wholly run its destructive course in the school-room. It requires no stretch of fancy, if the subject demanded, to trace, on the one hand, the *logical* nexus between the experimentalism of Bacon and the scepticism of John Locke a century later; or, on the other, between the scepticism of John Locke and the atheism of the philosophers of the Revolution—Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and the Encyclopædists generally—his admirers and the champions of his principles throughout France and the world. Where the philosophy of the period had thus slipped from position to position—from irreconcilable beliefs to Naturalism, from Naturalism to Materialism, from Materialism to Scepticism, from Scepticism to Atheism—it is not surprising to find that the groundwork of the non-Catholic educational systems which cropped up under their separate patronage and influence,

should have been largely permeated by the unsound principles which they invoked. A lamentable confusion of the nature of spirit and its essential relations to matter; a consequent misapprehension of the character and scope of moral responsibility; a mistaken idea of life and its purpose, and the intricate philosophy of its manifold environments, visible and invisible, could not, as a result, but find their way into the class-room and leave their impress upon the intellectual as they certainly did upon the political and social development of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

On the side of Catholicism we behold quite a different spirit at work. It may be best described as a determination to carry out to the full, now that circumstances permitted, the wise provisions of the Council of Trent upon the subject of primary, secondary, and higher education. Those provisions were sufficiently ample and explicit. Priests were to devote themselves in a special manner to the training of youths. Pastors were to instruct their flocks. Parochial schools, wherever they had declined or disappeared, were to be reëstablished and competent teachers secured. Every encouragement was to be given to the various religious orders recently instituted for the development of secondary instruction. Bishops were to provide their dioceses, where feasible, with seminaries for the education of the clergy. Universities still under the control of the Church were to be safeguarded from the encroachment of prevailing novelties, that no taint of suspicion might dim the lustre of their record, impair their general usefulness, or compromise the sacred authority from which they held their charter. So spoke the Council in substance; and that its declarations filled the needs of the hour was manifested by the readiness with which they were caught up and acted upon in the numerous provincial and diocesan synods convened throughout France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands, shortly after its adjournment in December, 1563. Perhaps in Saint Charles Borromeo, and the reforms which he set on foot in the diocese of Milan, we have the most striking illustration of the character of the new activity, as well as the clearest indication of the lines of development upon which the future educational policy of the Church was to proceed. In 1565, im-

mediately upon assuming the duties of his high charge, he convened a provincial synod. The subject of education was foremost amongst the matters discussed by the bishops assembled. The practical upshot of their deliberations was the establishment of colleges at Milan, Pavia, Arona, Lucerne, and Fribourg. Within the diocese of Milan alone he erected six seminaries, where every facility for the most thorough training was to be had. He was fully persuaded that the primary need of religion in every age is a pious and learned priesthood. Acting upon this conviction, he undertook to accomplish for his own diocese what Saint Vincent de Paul and the Venerable Olier were to do for the Church universal in the near future, by the institution of their now illustrious congregations. Nor did the Cardinal's work stop here. He organized scientific academies among the learned for the discussion of recondite subjects. He founded numerous poor schools where at least the elements could be had by those whom circumstances prevented from aspiring to anything higher. He saw to it that, as far as depended upon him, not even the humblest and neediest of his flock should be deprived of the priceless boon of Christian knowledge.

We might associate with this picture as a companion piece, that of the renowned Archbishop of Braga, Dom Bartholomew of the Martyrs, doing a similar work in Portugal. We might dilate upon the labors of Cardinal Pole striving for the revival of Catholic education in England during the troubled years of Mary's reign, and while the Council of Trent, from which he had been hurriedly summoned, was still in session. But we will not, for the reason that, comprehensive as were his plans, generous as were his endeavors, they were eventually brought to naught, in the pandemonium which followed. The purpose of the Council of Trent throughout, in all that concerned education, had been a radical and lasting reform. Its suggestions had been adopted with the most widespread and favorable results. But the evils checked and the progress made had been in the teeth of constant political upheavals which lent an air of uncertainty to undertakings and interfered not a little with that corporate endeavor which alone gives assurance of permanence and solidity. But no sooner were arms laid down, nearly a century later, by the treaty of

Westphalia, than the field was free. Both parties were thrown upon the strength of their individual resources. Principles were pitted against principles—methods against methods. Each fell to the organizing of studies as the most effective means of attaining its desired end. The Germans on both sides took the lead in pedagogical development, with the French and the Italian in the second place. Most of what we have in English, with some worthy exceptions, is mere translation from one or other of these languages. Of English *Catholic* pedagogy, barring translations, we have next to nothing—a painful but a necessary admission.

Of Protestant writers of systems—if indeed we may so designate them, since many of them are rather a piecing together of details than coherent scientific structures—whose work calls for special attention as illustrating the logical development in the school-room of the teachings of the Reformation, we may mention Sturm, Ratisch, Comenius, Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Francke, Basedow, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Jacotot. Of these, the two first, Sturm and Ratisch, antedate, while the two last, Froebel and Jacotot, follow the period comprised within the limits of the present paper. Nevertheless, for the sake of clearness and to unify our reflections, we have included them under one head. There are, of course, numerous other well known non-Catholic contributors to the subject, but as their influence has been less general we shall content ourselves with simply recalling their names. There was Ascham, the friend of Erasmus, tutor to Queen Elizabeth, and the first writer in English upon pedagogics; Dean Colet, a Catholic of doubtful leanings, founder of the famous school at Saint Paul's, London; John Milton, our great epicist, whose *Tractate upon Education*, while not embodying a system, is nevertheless entitled to regard for its many valuable suggestions; Richard Mulcaster, whose work on *Positions* has been described as "one of the earliest and still one of the best treatises in the English language;" Lancaster and Bell, authors of the system which bears their name and is so widely adopted throughout Great Britain; and the celebrated Doctor Arnold, of Rugby. Among the French, Rabelais and Montaigne should be mentioned. They have furnished us with no system, but merely with views, good, bad, and indifferent, upon education—the one

in his *Pantagruel*, and the other in his *Essays*. Among the Germans were Reuchlin, Trotzendorf, Neander, Herder, Rochow, Spener, Gesner, Fellenberg, Ernesti, Heyne, Semler, Gedike, Krusi, Diesterweg, Zeller, Graser, and Stephani. This list of names, which is only partial, suffices to give us some idea of the prodigious enterprise of the Protestant world in educational matters. It does not include, either, a considerable number of writers upon the theory of education and pedagogics, whose opinions are well known and are exerting no slight influence upon the trend of contemporary educational thought—such, for instance, as Bain, Mill, Huxley, and especially Mr. Herbert Spencer, whose ideas, it has been asserted, will constitute the groundwork of the education of the future. Formidable, however, as this showing is, we are happy to say, and will make good the statement, that in all essential points it was off-set and in many respects anticipated by an equally extended development on the Catholic side.

Sturm, who was the first to become renowned for his educational theories, fell under the double influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation. He combines, therefore, the spirit of both and is the fittest illustration of the Protestant humanistic pedagogical epoch, which is the first in the order of time. He represents the transition from Catholicity to Protestantism in education, as Pestalozzi, more than two centuries later, would represent the transition from Protestantism to Rationalism. As he wrote at a period of revolution and change in the intellectual world, we are not surprised to find him mistaking, in many respects, the true nature and scope of his subject. The cultivation of the Latin and, to a less extent, of the Greek classics was, as we have seen, the rage, and their study constituted by far the major portion of his ten years' curriculum. The vernacular, mathematics, history, and the sciences generally played but an inferior part in his pedagogical schemes. The accumulation of elegant words and phrases; the structural analysis of sentences in quest of hidden charms; the dexterous manipulation of idiomatic expressions in conversation and composition, and similar academic performances, was his highest aim, while the acquisition of a faultless classicism impressed him as the noblest object attainable by a scholar. For this reason, Cicero was the chief model of study. Strange to say,

Nepos found no place on his programme—though his antipathy for the involved sentences of Livy and the concise style of Tacitus are much more readily understood. As *we* view it, his concept, like the field of mental activity which it opened up, was altogether too narrow. Still, we cannot blame him. He wrote for his *own* time and not for *ours*, and in giving the classics what seems to us an altogether undue preference, he catered, no doubt, to the unmistakable public taste of his day. But it was not long before the Reformation and Humanism parted company. Left to itself, and with nothing but its elastic principle of individual and independent judgment to guide it, Protestantism entered upon its chequered career in the class-room. Its first outgrowth was the school of Realism. Private interpretation in matters religious had been met half-way by the now popular Baconian theory of induction in matters scientific, and together they constituted the basis of the new educational departure. Its champions, because of the novelty of their method, were called Innovators or Progressives. Chief amongst them were Ratisch and Comenius, and later, Francke, who, however, was rather a Realistic-Pietist in that he supplemented the principles of out-and-out Realism by a strict moral training in Lutheran tenets. Realism was distinctly a reaction against the excessive formalism, which it was thought, and with reason, had distinguished as well as impaired the usefulness of other and earlier methods. Various as were its modifications, they concurred in a few fundamental principles, the bare mention of which shows us the Reformation carrying the Baconian theories to dangerous and unwarrantable extremes. Educational development, they maintained, to be logical should proceed from the concrete to the abstract. Consequently, knowledge was not to be sought in the correlation of *a priori* principles, but only in the handling and analysis of things themselves. "Things, not words," was their motto. The student was, therefore, rather to teach himself by observation than depend on the authority of the teacher, which authority was to be reduced to a minimum. Interest was to be the ruling incentive in youth to the acquisition of knowledge, and coercion was to be avoided. As learning, like everything else, was valuable only in so far as it was here and now useful, nothing was to be studied or committed to memory

which the student did not understand. We see here the beginning of a reaction not only against the excessive classicism of the Renaissance, which made all culture subservient to ancient models and authority, but also against the truths of revelation, which were not to be impressed upon youthful minds for the reason that they are unintelligible. This was the Realistic tendency pure and simple, of which we find large traces in much of the mechanical work which goes by the name of education in our day. Ratisch did not succeed. His work, however, failed less for want of merit than because it promised much more than it fulfilled. Besides, in some of its provisions it was impracticable and, as Von Raumer expresses it, too tedious. Thus to illustrate. In the study of authors, say of Terence, one of his pet models, we are told that the teacher, or one of the pupils, is first to read to the class each passage assigned for translation nine times—six times in Latin and three times in German. This, no doubt, for the purpose of impressing it upon the minds of the student by a sort of absorption or process of mental infiltration. In the emphasis which he laid upon the study of the vernacular and other modern languages, we behold a real and useful addition. Comenius, who flourished from 1592 to 1671, plays a much more prominent part in the historical development of Realism in education. He was a Moravian bishop. His system was remarkable for two features. First, the great extent to which he applied the Baconian principles of inductive research in pedagogics; and secondly, the practice of teaching by illustration—a practice for which he is wholly credited by many, but which, as he tells us himself, he copied from the Jesuits of Salamanca. His three chief works are the *Methodus Novissima*, the *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*, and the *Janua Linguarum Reserata*. The last is an encyclopædic text-book giving a brief history of well nigh everything. It consists of a hundred chapters. In the ninety-ninth chapter the world comes to an end, and in the one hundredth the author bids his reader adieu. Its popularity in its day is evidenced by the fact that it was translated into twelve European and several Asiatic languages. His *Orbis Pictus* was long a favorite text-book, and for two hundred years held its own in the schools of Germany. The modified Realists, while accepting as a working principle the motto, "things, not

words," added to the study of nature an organized system of moral training. From this fact they were called Pietists. Francke, who died in 1727, was foremost in the work. He was a professor of Greek and Oriental languages at the University of Halle, then recently founded, mainly through the enterprising efforts of the celebrated Spener, his associate in much that he undertook. His educational ventures were varied and included the establishment of orphanages and normal schools, of neither of which, can he, with any truth, be said to have been the original projector. The features of his system may be briefly summarized as follows: Strict moral training; the neglect of Greek classics and the substitution in their stead of the New Testament; the study of Hebrew for its Biblical importance, and the vernacular; and finally, the cultivation of the "Realien" or Real Studies. As was to have been expected, opposition was soon developed against the strict moral régime which he everywhere sought to enforce. It was set down as cant and hypocrisy and more calculated to warp and falsify than to develop and ennoble character. In spite of attacks, though, his methods, his popularity, and many of the results of his labors have survived to our times. Simultaneously with the progress of the realistic schools, whether purely such or modified by Pietism, we behold the advocates of Humanism still clinging to the ancient classics as the true basis of education; making, however, as they went along, such concessions to Realism as the necessities of the period seemed to demand. Their position, it would seem, was not altogether unlike that of many of our modern colleges whose curricula are made up of classical and commercial studies. They were known as reformed Philologists, because occupying, by reason of new principles, a place in advance of that held by the old philologists without, by any means, accepting the theories of the Realists, in their totality. They attempted a sort of *via media* between two extremes, and in the unsatisfactory attempt to effect a compromise, emphasized the shortcomings of both, and prepared the way for the still more radical stand taken by the Naturalists.

The principle of Naturalism which had been long at work, found its first notable development in England and its chief exponent in John Locke—the so-called "Father of English philoso-

phy." It soon overspread France and Germany and forced its way into everything—literature, science, art, and life. It was an apotheosis of Nature and meant a complete rejection of revelation. Of course, it very soon worked itself into pedagogics, and, not satisfied with the study of nature as the Realists had been, pushed its position to the extreme of asserting that beyond nature there was nothing to study. It was the Baconian theory and Realism gone mad. Its principles, as far as they have to do with our present subject, may be briefly summarized as follows: (*a*) All training and instruction should be divorced from positive Christianity, and recognize as religion only that which the laws of nature teach. (*b*) Consequently, the teacher's attitude towards his pupils is not to be positive, *i. e.*, he is not to communicate knowlege by precept, but allow his charge by observation and reflection to bring into play the powers of his mind and thus educate himself. Let the student *grow*, and under the spontaneous influence of environment attain to the maturity of his natural capacities. (*c*) Moral instruction should not be explicitly imparted. The child is to develop unaided his moral instincts—for to anything higher he is not expected to ascend. The teacher's influence, as far as it is exerted at all, is to serve merely as a preventive, warding off all attacks upon virtue, but suggesting nothing. Physical culture, which was practically ignored in previous systems, is to be sedulously attended to—a physical culture that will harden the system and render it proof against outside attacks. We have said that Naturalism took its rise and, in the person of John Locke, found its chief exponent in England. It was in France, however, and a century later, that it was to attain its first great popularity at the hands of its most enthusiastic patrons and heralds. These were the French Encyclopædists, of whom Voltaire was the prince and leader. They saw in the sensism of the English philosopher the materialistic principles which would best serve their purpose and enable them to bring to flower and fruit, as they subsequently did at the period of the Revolution, the deistic and atheistic tendencies which distinguish that epoch of universal intellectual fermentation. Speaking of the French *philosophers*, Heine, who was in perfect accord with their views, says: "The essay on the Human Understanding became

their gospel—the gospel they swore by." Not that they had been altogether uninfluenced by "the earlier writers of their own country," as, for instance, by Montaigne and Bayle; but, as they themselves admitted, Locke was their master and leader. Beginning with Locke himself, the Naturalists felt that they had a mission to perform, and, destructive as it was, began its accomplishment in the field of pedagogics. In the principles which they advocated Realism found an ally; Humanism, its greatest antagonist; and the Rationalism of the present century, the germ element of its prolific life and activity. Locke's *Thoughts upon Education*, Rousseau's *Emile*, and Basedow's *Elementary*, are the best formulation of the naturalistic educational views. Locke, who was born in 1632, published his *Thoughts upon Education* in 1693. They are embodied in the maxim, *mens sana in corpore sano*. His philosophical bias limited his idea of development to the study of the material world, while his profession of medicine led him to lay too great stress upon the cultivation of hygiene. He furnishes us with no system, and some of his ideas upon physical culture are extremely novel, but would hardly commend themselves to the medical fraternity of our times. The following may serve as a specimen of much more. The child is to be educated at home and not at school. He is to be made to wash his face in cold water once a day. His shoes should be thin, and, if need be, full of holes, so as to let in water whenever he comes too near it; this will make him careful and teach him prudence. While young he should not be allowed to eat flesh meat, and when old should be permitted it only once a day. For breakfast he should be given brown bread with or without butter. His drink should be small beer, and his physic poppy-water. This process is intended, he says, to harden children as they grow up, though, as Herbert Spencer dryly remarks, it was a process far more calculated to harden them out of existence.

Jean Jacques Rousseau, who flourished from 1712 to 1778, embodied in his *Emile* many of the suggestions of his English predecessors. While not a formal treatise, *Emile* is distinctly an educational work. Largely speculative, much that it contains was reduced to practice later, especially by Pestalozzi and Froe-

bel. It has been characterized as "a superfine Sanford and Merton," the education of Emile and Sophie furnishing the author with an opportunity of ventilating his educational theories. The work, while containing much that may be instructive, abounds in paradoxes and crudities. As an example of the dangerous absurdity of some of its principles we may cite the following: "Let us lay it down as incontrovertible," he says, "that the primary impulses of nature are always right. There is no native perversity in the human heart"—a pagan sentiment which the Roman poet had expressed before him—

"Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto."

With such principles, it is not surprising that it exercised a most pernicious influence towards the close of the last century. Basedow, whom we have selected as the third representative of the Naturalistic school, was a German, and lived from 1723 to 1790. As Locke had influenced Rousseau, so, in turn, Rousseau's *Emile* did much to determine the direction of Basedow's educational activity. Indeed, his root-ideas are those of Rousseau. His chief merit lay in the variety by which he sought to render class-work interesting, as also in the store which he set by conversation as the most effective means of acquiring language. True to the principles upon which his system was operated, no religious training was imparted, save that of a "human, superficial, lifeless and absurd patchwork of natural religion," as Barnard phrases it. A child's natural inclinations were to be directed but never suppressed or supplemented by anything higher, for nature is always right and self-sufficient. With the aid of friends he succeeded in erecting at Dessau his famous school called the Philanthropinum, an institution wherein Nature was to be strictly followed and in which all were to partake upon an equal footing of the educational benefits which it had to bestow. In it much attention was given to physical exercise, and for the first time, says Quick, gymnastics were introduced into the school curriculum. Basedow remained at the head of its staff of professors until a dissipated life necessitated his removal. Despite the connection with it of Camp, Saltzmann, Wolfe, Wolke, Olivier, Mathieson, Bahrdt, and other pedagogues of note, it never enjoyed a large attendance,

though it was patronized from great distances. While in a measure it stimulated educational enterprise on its own peculiar lines in other parts of Europe, especially in Switzerland and Russia, it gradually declined and was closed in 1793.

The attitude assumed by the Naturalists had been too boldly asserted for the taste of many. Its position, they thought, was extreme and radical. Out of the conflict there arose in pedagogics the school of Modern Illuminism, which, though in reality nothing more than Rationalism, seemed to differ from it by reason of the religious element which it sought to emphasize in education. Its champions, Rochow, Heineke, Herder and notably Pestalozzi, were imbued with the principles of religion and eager to re-assert its claims to a place in the class-room. Unfortunately, however, religion, as they conceived it, bore no kinship to positive Christianity. Whether they knew it or not, it was simply the old Realism masquerading under a new name, and waiting till the infidel philosophy of the eighteenth century in Germany and France would summon it to life again. Pestalozzi was the most celebrated representative of this school, which fills the transitional period from the last to the present century. He was born in 1746 and died in 1827. Like many who had preceded him, and like most of those who were his contemporaries, he had been largely influenced by the *Emile* of Rousseau. In his three works, *Leonard and Gertrude*, *How Gertrude Teaches her Children*, and the *Book for Mothers*, he sets forth his views. In some respects they differ but little from those of Basedow and the Naturalists generally. In others they are more original. The defects in his method have been reduced to the following three or four. Too much stress was laid upon speculative studies. The knowledge imparted was not sufficiently positive. "Simplification was carried too far. Too little attention was given to historical truth and to testimony," as a criterion of evidence—particularly in what concerned religion, the knowledge of which he looked upon as innate. His system had to do with elementary education merely, and furnished his pupil, Froebel, with many of the ideas which he subsequently wove into his *Kindergarten*. His method of instruction became exceedingly popular, and, with few modifications, is still largely in vogue in Germany. Pestalozzi is

the link between the old and new, and, in the opinion of his admirers, has been the largest contributor to the educational progress of the nineteenth century. With him the science of non-Catholic pedagogical development ceased. The present century has simply fallen heir to the principles and works of the eighteenth. Froebel (1783–1852) and Jacotot (1770–1840) are an inheritance from the last century. Whatever credit we may give them for the details of their respective systems, the principles of the "Kindergarten" and "Self-instruction" were not new. For this reason, Froebel and Jacotot are more properly called methodizers than inventors of systems. The former, Froebel, did much towards converting the waste energies of earlier childhood into channels of activity. His attempts, whatever their results elsewhere, have been heartily responded to in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, France, and the United States, and to some extent in England. The Kindergarten movement is spreading rapidly, and its literature is becoming daily more and more abundant. Jacotot's method of self-instruction, which he himself summarized in the four words—learn, repeat, reflect, and verify—has become practically obsolete, though traces of it are still to be met with in some of the schools of Belgium and France. There are not wanting those, however, amongst them Mr. Payne, who believe that in its principles at least it is destined to revive—that "the soul of it will, some day, be infused into a new body, to be succeeded, perhaps, by another and another educational metempsychosis as we advance in our conceptions of the true relations between teaching and learning." Whether such will ever be the case or not we must leave to the future to decide.

We have mentioned these various non-Catholic systems since a right understanding of the principles from which they sprang, and which they were fashioned to propagate, will enable us more fully to appreciate the scope and character of contemporaneous Catholic development, which, while founded throughout upon one and the same eternal truth, varied in accidental structure to suit the changing exigencies of the times. Counter-systems they may be designated, since they were intended to stem the current of heresy so busily at work in the class-room during the period of their respective evolution. The only Catholic system which

preceded the year 1648 was that of the Jesuits. The monasteries, it is true, centuries before the foundation of the Society of Jesus, had their *Trivium* and *Quadrivium;* but the monastic courses of study were a very variable quantity, and in scarcely two instances did *Trivium* and *Quadrivium* mean exactly the same thing. They were strangers in those days to educational systems as the word is now commonly understood. Ignatius of Loyola realized the need, and his object in the establishment of the Company was not merely to supply the Church with a corps of teachers, for she had never been without them, but with one organized upon definite lines and suited to the new requirements, and whose very compactness would render it an efficient aid in her hands for the refutation of error and the dissemination of truth. In consequence, a uniform educational plan was immediately drafted and put on trial in the colleges of his Order. In the general Congregation which elected his successor in 1558, the method hitherto in vogue was discussed, and modified, and made the groundwork of the "*Ratio Studiorum*," as it was still further enlarged and improved under the generalship of Aquaviva in 1584. This is not the place to discuss the "*Ratio*" as a system. Sufficient to say that it has served its purpose in the department of both secondary and higher education, for three hundred years, and is still the law for the government of Jesuit institutions of learning. In its scope it extends from grammar to divinity, and, in not a few of its provisions, anticipated many of the supposed original features of later systems. The next system of Catholic education which made its appearance was that of the French Oratorians, founded by Cardinal de Berulle in 1611. The Oratorians accomplished much during the two centuries of their existence. The object of the Order was twofold—the training of the diocesan clergy and public instruction. Some idea of the rapidity with which it spread may be gathered from the fact that when the founder died, in 1629, it had already established schools in numerous cities of France, as also in Rome, Madrid, Constantinople, and throughout the Netherlands. It had at least fifty institutions in operation. Malebranche and Masillon may be named as amongst its eminent scholars. Thomassin, the well known theologian, belonged to the Order, and has embodied in his *Methode d'Enseigner et d'Etudier*, its system of education. Unfortunately, some of its members fell

into Cartesianism in philosophy, and into Jansenism in theology, which gave rise not only to discord within the body itself but to censure and mistrust from without. It was therefore not surprising that at the time of the French Revolution many of them took the civil oath and joined the Constitutional Church. The Congregation itself was finally dissolved, but Pius IX restored it in 1864 under the title of the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception—the Pères Gratry and Cardinal Perraud being its most illustrious ornaments in our day.

We spoke of Jansenism. Let us say a word in passing about the famous community of Port Royal. We say "in passing," for as educators its members accomplished comparatively little, and hence need not detain us long. Writers of the stamp of Saint-Beuve, Compayre, and Oscar Browning, with whom historical exactness is not a specialty, have striven hard to encircle their memories with a halo of pedagogical renown, less, it would seem, out of regard for them than to asperse their traditional foes, the Jesuits. The truth is, they never had more than fifty pupils at any one time in their schools, while the schools themselves flourished for only fifteen years. Their educational method was certainly not without its good features, and some men of rare parts, notably Arnoudt, Quesnel, Lancelot, and the witty Pascal, whose *Provincial Letters*, in spite of their fictitious contents, have made him famous, were found amongst them. Their peculiar theological views, however, made them a menace to the Church. Here was the cause, and not a professional jealousy, of the persistent attacks upon them by the Society of Jesus. Their sympathizers, when dwelling so pathetically upon the harsh treatment which they sustained at the hands of the Order, should not fail, as they invariably do, to inform the reader that this opposition was more than sanctioned by Clement XI, whose Bull "*Unigenitus*," published in 1713, wiped Jansenism out of existence, while the legislation of subsequent pontiffs administered the death-blow to its serpentine spirit still lurking in the grass. The Port Royalists, like the dark heresy which they sought to foist upon the Church, are now things of the past. Peace, then, to their memories, their ashes, and their souls.

[To be concluded.]

Chicago, Ill. EUGENE MAGEVNEY, S.J.

THE CAUSALITY (DISPOSITIVE) OF THE SACRAMENTS.[1]

III.

IN a preceding article I have defined the terms, the knowledge of which is necessary for the understanding of the controversy respecting the causality of the Sacraments, and we have discussed St. Thomas' teaching on the point. It remains to bring forward the theological arguments that can be adduced in support of our position, viz.: (1) that the Sacraments are dispositive instruments in the conferring of grace; and (2) that their instrumentality belongs to the intentional order.

1. My proof of the dispositive instrumentality of the Sacraments has already been given in my examination of the teaching of St. Thomas. For I showed from the Angelic Doctor, that no created instruments can be employed in the divine operations, such as creation, justification, etc., except in so far as it may be necessary to prepare the subject, if there be one, for the reception of the divine effect. Since the soul is the recipient of grace, the Sacraments may have this preparatory instrumentality, but nothing further. They can be only dispositive instruments of grace.

2. If we argue from the received principles which govern the theology of the Sacraments, we reach the same conclusion. St. Augustine[2] defines a sacrament to be *signum rei sacrae*, "a sign of a sacred thing." The Catechism of the Council of Trent[3] approves this definition as expressing most clearly and lucidly the nature of the Sacraments, and states that it was accepted by all the scholastic doctors, while it supplements it with an alternative and equivalent definition that a sacrament is "a visible sign of invisible grace." But the Sacraments are not merely speculative signs, *i. e.*, whose sole duty is to communicate the knowledge of something else; they are practical signs, signs, that is, which are not only signs, but also causes,—causes of that which they signify. This we learn from the Council of Trent,[4] which defines that the Sacraments of the New Law contain the grace which

[1] See AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, January, p. 35.

[2] *De Civ. Dei*, l. x, c. 5.

[3] *De Sacramentis in Genere*, n. 4.

[4] Sess. 7, can. 6.

they signify; *i. e.*, they contain it as a cause contains its effect.[5] Now since practical signs are the causes of the thing they signify, it is impossible for a practical sign to be true, and yet to produce no effect. It would be false and self-contradictory. But a sacrament is, as we have said, a practical sign, and a valid sacrament is a *true* practical sign. Therefore it cannot exist without actually producing that which, as a practical sign, it immediately signifies. Faith, however, tells us that sacraments can be valid and yet not confer grace; as, for example, baptism received in formal heresy or schism; and this is implied, too, in the definition of the Council of Trent[6] that the Sacraments of the New Law contain the grace which they signify (this without restriction), but confer it only upon those who have placed no impediment in the way. We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that grace, as actually conferred upon the recipient of the sacrament, is not the immediate and unconditional practical signification and effect of a valid sacrament; but rather a title to grace, a disposition which is not incompatible with continuance in a state of sin; which, therefore, can always be produced by a valid sacrament, whether received worthily or sacrilegiously, and which, in the case of an unworthy reception, will obtain its natural fulfilment by the actual bestowal of grace, on the removal of the obstacle.

Again, the Sacraments contain the grace which they signify, after the manner of *instrumental* causes.[7] Now an instrumental cause cannot contain its effect unless it is in the very act of producing it. For without the instrumental virtue which it receives from the principal agent, it has no power to produce this effect, and therefore cannot be said to contain it. Nor does it receive this instrumental virtue except when it is in actual use, and, therefore, actually producing its effect. The operative power of the principal agent has no stable existence in the instrument, but passes from the principal cause, through the instrument, to the effect. It is in the instrument only in the state of transition or flux, like water in the bed of a river. Hence an instrument contains its effect only when in the act of causation. Therefore, the

[5] *Cf.* Catechism of the Council, *ibid.*, n. 7.

[6] S. 7, can. 6.

[7] *Conc. Trid.* s. 6, cap. 7.

containing and the production of the effect are identical in an instrument. But a valid sacrament must always contain and therefore cause grace, and yet does not always actually confer it.[8] Consequently the immediate and infallible effect, the effect which can never be lacking, is grace, not in its actual bestowal, but in an antecedent disposition which is a right and title to grace; which right is recognized and grace conferred, provided that there is no impediment.

3. The Sacraments not only cause *what* they signify; they also cause *because* they are signs, and *inasmuch as* they signify. The causation is entirely dependent on the signification, as regards both the nature and the order of the effects. St. Thomas says, "Sacramenta *significando* causant," and holds that they are suitable instruments in the production of grace in the soul precisely because they are signs.[9] The signification and the causation are therefore coördinate and inseparable.[10] Hence, if we find that the outward sign always signifies something that is of its own nature antecedent to grace, and that it signifies grace only through the medium of this immediate signification, it will follow that the production of grace takes the same order; that something naturally anterior to grace is the immediate effect of the sacrament, and

[8] *Conc. Trid.*, s. 7, can 6.

[9] *De Ver.*, q. 27, a. 4, ad 13.

[10] There is also a metaphysical reason for this, viz., the operation of an instrument is twofold: it has the operation proper and natural to itself, independent of the principal agent, and springing from its own inherent and natural activity; and it has the instrumental operation in dependence upon and under the influence of the principal agent. But the instrument receives the virtue of the principal agent only when it is in the actual exercise of its own proper operation. (This presupposes of course that local motion which is required by all inanimate agents in order that they may exert even their natural activity; but this is not necessarily derived from an intellectual agent, as is the instrumental virtue.) And this instrumental virtue is received into the instrument's natural operation, and modifies and elevates it, so as to enable it to produce the higher effect. Thus it is the natural operation of a brush to spread paint upon a canvas, and the finished artistic picture is its instrumental effect; but it is obvious that the latter cannot be produced except in the execution of the former. Similarly the operation natural to the sacramental sign is to signify, its instrumental operation to cause, grace. Therefore, the sacraments can cause grace only when and in so far as they signify it. If they immediately signify something else appertaining to the order of grace and grace itself only mediately, then grace will not be the immediate but the mediate effect. *Cf.* St. Thomas *De Ver.*, q. 27, a. 4, and *Summa*, 3 p., q. 62, a. 1, ad 2.

that the actual infusion of grace into the soul depends upon this precedent effect.

Now let us take and examine the Sacraments one by one, beginning with the greatest of all, the *Holy Eucharist.* What is the immediate signification of the outward sign (*i. e.*, the species of bread and wine, together with the words of the form, "This is my Body," "This is my Blood")? Undoubtedly, it is the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and the resultant Real Presence of our Divine Lord under the species of the bread and wine. And everyone understands this to be also the immediate *effect.* Nor does the outward sign signify the special grace of the Holy Eucharist, viz., the spiritual nourishment of the soul, except through the medium of the Real Presence. Hence our Lord said,[11] "The bread that I will give is my flesh;" "My flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed." The sacrament of the Holy Eucharist therefore signifies and causes in the first instance the Real Presence of our Lord under the species of bread and wine, and through that Presence it is also the sign of the spiritual nourishment of the soul by sanctifying grace, and therefore the cause of that grace in those who receive the sacrament worthily.

Next in order are the three sacraments which confer a character. It is obvious that the direct and immediate purpose of the sacrament of *Order* is not the bestowal of grace, but the conferment of a sacred spiritual power, appointment to a sacred office in the hierarchy of the Church. This office involves the performance of certain spiritual duties, and as these duties cannot be worthily fulfilled without a special grace from God, the possession of power and office of the priesthood becomes a right and title to that special grace. The whole ceremonial of the sacrament of Order clearly points to this, and especially the essential portion of the rite. Thus, as St. Thomas says in the *Summa,*[12] hands are imposed in this sacrament, because "by it is conferred a certain preëminence of power in the divine mysteries," and the tradition of the instruments and the words, "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God," etc., explicitly signify the sacerdotal power and dignity,

[11] John 6: 52, 56.

[12] 3 p., q. 84, a. 4.

which gives, as we have said, the right to special graces of the priesthood.

In *Confirmation* the Christian is made the soldier and the standard-bearer of Christ, with the duty of confessing and defending the Christian faith before and against the world. He is therefore signed with the sign of Christ upon his forehead, and is anointed with oil to signify that maturity and robustness of strength which is required in the soldier, and as this duty cannot be performed in an efficient manner without the divine assistance, the sacrament further signifies the necessary grace, and confers it upon the worthy recipient.

In the sacrament of *Baptism*, although the outward sign does signify the interior ablution of the soul by grace, yet its immediate signification cannot be the actual bestowal of grace, but only an inchoate bestowal, consisting in a right to the grace of the sacrament. For the immediate and precise signification of the sacramental sign is determined by the words of the form; and the form of Baptism is limited in its immediate signification to this incipient bestowal of grace, by reason of the condition of the minister of the sacrament. For he cannot know with certainty (in adult baptism) whether the interior dispositions of soul requisite for the worthy reception of the sacrament are present, and yet he must always, in administering the sacrament, speak with the same certainty, the same positiveness; he must always categorically pronounce the soul's ablution. And if the sacrament be validly conferred, the categorical declaration, "I baptize thee," must be true. We know, moreover, that the validity of Baptism does not depend upon the *ex opere operantis* dispositions of the recipient, or upon the actual conferment of grace. If then the minister can say with truth, "I wash thee," even when there is no actual reception of grace, the words of the form cannot immediately and unconditionally represent the actual conferment of grace, but only an inchoate bestowal, a bestowal of grace *in actu primo*, which is in itself a title to the reception of grace *in actu secundo*, when the obstacle is removed. Hence the correct interpretation of the form of Baptism is, "I apply to thee the sacrament of ablution," that is, "I give you the right to receive the grace which will wash the stains of sin from your soul," just as, according to St. Thomas,[13]

[13] *Summa*, 3 p., q. 84, a. 3, ad 5.

the true explanation of the form of Penance is, "I apply to thee the sacrament of absolution," and not "*ego te absolutum ostendo.*" [14]

The explanation of the outward sign of *Penance*, therefore, is similar to that of Baptism. Penance is a judicial process, and the form of the sacrament is a judicial sentence of absolution. But the sentence of acquittal must always be distinguished from the actual release of the prisoner. It gives him a right to have that sentence executed, but it is not the execution of the sentence. Hence the sentence of absolution pronounced by the priest in the tribunal of Penance does not immediately signify the actual remission of sins, but only a right to that remission.

The form of the sacrament of *Extreme Unction* is deprecative or oblative. The dying man is committed to the merciful hands of God in order that He may perfect in the soul whatever is required for its eternal salvation. Consequently, the immediate signification of the sacrament is not the actual conferring of grace, but the committal of the sufferer into the hands of God. But since this expression of the desire of the Church is efficacious *ex opere operato*, by reason of its sacramental institution, its immediate effect of committing the sick person into the hands of God carries with it a title to the divine assistance, *i. e.*, to grace.

The outward sign of *Matrimony* is the contract of marriage between two baptized persons, and its immediate signification and effect is the marriage bond. But by the elevation of Matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament, the marriage bond further entitles the contracting parties to divine grace, to enable them to fulfil the duties of the married state.

In every sacrament, therefore, there is an effect which is anterior to grace, and upon which the actual bestowal of the grace by God is dependent; that is to say, the Sacraments are the dispositive causes of grace.

This argument receives confirmation from the doctrine and practice of the Church with respect to the repetition of the Sacra-

[14] The form of Baptism cannot be interpreted, "I wash away thy sins as far as in me lies," for that would invalidate the sacrament when the interior dispositions of the soul were wanting. It would merely express an ineffectual intention on the part of the minister, and therefore the sacrament would have to be repeated in order that original sin be washed away; which is heretical.

ments, to which I referred in my previous article. The Sacraments which confer a character can never be repeated; Extreme Unction may not be readministered while the same danger of death continues; a new marriage cannot be contracted so long as both husband and wife are living; while the Holy Eucharist and Penance can be repeated indefinitely. Now this teaching and practice of the Church can be explained only by the doctrine of the "*res et sacramentum*," as the intermediate effect between the sacrament and grace, upon which the grace of the sacrament is itself dependent. For Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Order cannot be repeated because they confer an indelible character, a perpetual title to grace. During the continuance of the same danger of death the committal of the sick person into the hands of God by Extreme Unction, holds good, and gives him a right to the sacramental grace. The sacrament of Matrimony cannot be repeated while both parties to a previous contract are still living, because the marriage bond is dissoluble only by the death of one of them. But if grace were a sacramental effect coördinate with and independent of the "*res et sacramentum*," even though a new "*res et sacramentum*" could not be produced, yet each repetition of the sacrament would give an increase of grace; and this would be amply sufficient ground for the repetition. But if grace is given because of a disposition in the soul which entitles it to grace, this disposition, as long as it remains in the soul, will be the cause of the sacramental grace (provided that there is no impediment); and so the repetition of the sacrament is unnecessary, and would be null and void. On the other hand, there is no limit to the number of times the sacraments of Holy Eucharist and Penance can be received, because the "*res et sacramentum*" in each case is not permanent. In the Holy Eucharist, the Real Presence, which is the "*res et sacramentum*," ceases when the sacramental species are corrupted; and in the sacrament of Penance, the title to the remission of sins is fulfilled and therefore passes away when the sins confessed have been actually remitted. Consequently, to obtain fresh grace, and for the remission of further sins, a new title is required, and, therefore, a repetition of the sacrament.[15]

[15] *Cf.* Conc. Florentin., Decr. pro Armenis, de Sacramentis.

4. The last argument has for its basis the received doctrine that some, at least, of the sacraments (*e.g.*, those which imprint a character) may "revive";—that is: If a sacrament is received sacrilegiously, although it certainly produces no fruit of grace at the time of reception, yet if the recipient put himself into the proper dispositions at some future time, the sacramental grace which had been held suspended will be given to him. This doctrine is absolute, as far as Baptism is concerned, for it is the foundation of the teaching of the Church with regard to the rebaptism of heretics. Now the sacramental grace must be just as much the effect of the sacrament in the case of revival as it is in the worthy reception of the sacrament, for the universal condition of salvation, obligatory not only upon those who receive Baptism worthily, but also upon those who receive it unworthily, is regeneration of water and the Holy Ghost.[16] But how can Baptism received sacrilegiously produce the effect of grace? A sacrament is an efficient cause, which can operate directly in the production of its effect only while it is in existence; while, in the event of the revival of a sacrament, unworthily received, perhaps weeks or months previously, the instrumental cause, viz., the outward sign, has ceased to exist. How, then, can the sacrament be the efficient cause of the grace ultimately received? There is only one way, according to sound philosophy. If when an efficient cause is acting upon an object, an obstacle is presented to the production of the effect, that effect will follow upon the removal of the obstacle, supposing that the efficient cause has then ceased to operate, only provided that the cause has been able to leave behind it in the object a disposition sufficient to require the existence of the effect. Consequently, the revival of the Sacraments can be explained only by the fact that a sacrament, even when sacrilegiously received, causes in the recipient a disposition which is of itself sufficient to require the infusion of grace into the soul when the obstacle which has excluded the grace is taken away. This is

[16] Hence it is not correct to base the revival of the Sacraments upon the will of God, apart from all sacramental efficiency, the previous reception being, as it were, a mere pretext for an act of divine benevolence, by which God bestows grace upon the soul. This is pure and simple Occasionalism, and the grace would not be sacramental. The foundation of the revival of the sacrament must be sought in the very nature of the sacrament, and must have its origin in the divine institution.

dispositive causality. And if the dispositive causality suffices in one case that grace may be said to be caused *ex opere operato*, it suffices in every case. We must remember that theology, like other sciences, has its law of parsimony. In matters supernatural, for the knowledge of which we depend upon revelation, we have no right to go beyond what is required by Scripture and tradition. If a dispositive causality sufficiently explains what is contained in revelation about the causation of sacramental grace, then a perfective causality adds something of human invention, which must be eliminated.

And, as a matter of fact, this dispositive causality is absolutely required by the sources of revelation. For it would be absurd to assign two different modes of causality to one and the same sacrament, one for its worthy reception, the other for its revival. The causality of the Sacraments in the case of their revival is not a matter of special explicit revelation. We can point to no special testimony of Scripture or Apostolic tradition dealing with it. The revival of the Sacraments is simply a theological conclusion which the Doctors of the Church, and in particular St. Augustine, deduced from the uniform mode of sacramental causality. They found it provided for in the institution of the Sacraments, and in their nature. When they had to decide the special questions which arose with regard to those who were converted to the true faith after having been baptized in heresy or schism, they had no special revelation of the point to guide them. They had to solve the difficulties according to the general principle of the dependence of grace upon the sacrament. On the one hand Baptism could not be repeated; on the other, a sacrilegious reception is unproductive of grace. How, then, were those who had been baptized without the due dispositions, and afterwards converted, to be freed from original sin and possible actual sins committed before baptism? The answer was given, as I have said, in accordance with the general principles of sacramental causality. The Sacraments always cause grace, whenever the recipient is properly disposed, be it at the moment of actual reception or later; because they always cause something which is anterior to grace, and which no obstacle can exclude, provided that the sacrament is valid, namely, the "*res et sacramentum*," which is a dis-

position sufficient of itself to necessitate the ultimate effect of grace. If there is no impediment, grace follows upon the "*res et sacramentum*" at once; but if there is an impediment, grace cannot enter till it has been removed; but once the obstacle is taken away the "*res et sacramentum*" becomes operative, and the soul receives grace in exactly the same way as if there had never been any impediment. The mode of causality proper to the Sacraments, therefore, is that which is called instrumental dispositive causality. St. Augustine, in *De Baptismo contr. Donatist.*, l. 1, n. 17, says: "Just as in one who has approached the sacrament unworthily, Baptism is not repeated, but he is cleansed by holy correction and frank confession, so that *what was previously given now begins to be of avail for salvation, when the unworthiness of the reception has been removed* by a true confession, so also he who receives the baptism of Christ in heresy or schism (by which sacrilege his sins were not remitted), when he has corrected himself and has entered the society and unity of the Church, is not rebaptized, because by that very reconciliation and peace it is granted to him that the sacrament, which when received in schism was profitless, now in the unity begins to be efficacious for the remission of his sins."

We may conclude this portion of our subject with an illustration which, though imperfect, as all natural illustrations of the supernatural must be, may help to place our view of sacramental causality more clearly and concretely before the mind. A man holds in his hand a watch, which he proceeds to wind with a watch-key. The winding of the watch produces in it such a disposition that the works will immediately begin to move, the wheels and hands to revolve, if there is present nothing to prevent that movement. But suppose that some extraneous matter has in some way been introduced into the watch, so that it blocks the wheels, the watch must stop. But the disposition induced by the winding has not been destroyed, and the obstruction has only to be removed, and the watch will begin or resume its normal movement, just as though no obstacle had ever been there. Applying this to the Sacraments, the principal agent is God; the *instrumentum conjunctum* (the hand) is Christ as man; the watch is the soul; and the watch-key is the sacrament. The winding of

the watch represents the action of the sacrament in producing a disposition entitling the soul to grace; the motion of the watch is the grace itself; the obstruction to the watch's movement is the absence of the dispositions of soul *ex opere operantis*, which makes the reception of the sacrament sacrilegious and unfruitful. Finally, the resumption of the action of the watch on the removal of the obstruction symbolizes the infusion of the sacramental grace into the soul by virtue of the sacramental title already existing there, when the lack of the dispositions *ex opere operantis* has been supplied.[17]

One particular, amongst others, in which this illustration is not applicable to the Sacraments is that its instrumentality is physical, while that of the Sacraments is of the intentional order, as we now proceed to show.

IV.

1. Calling to mind the description already given of intentional cause, and remembering that the Sacraments are essentially signs, we at once reach the conclusion that their causality belongs to the intentional order. For a sign is something which impresses an image of itself upon the sense, and by so doing imparts to the intellect the knowledge of the something else. The operation proper to a sign, therefore, is to impress its image upon the sense, and this is certainly intentional, not physical. For the image received into the sensitive faculty is not a physical entity.[18] If it were a physical accident, it would communicate its properties to the sense, so that, for example, color would have to be predicated of the sight, etc. The sensitive image, by its presence, only *actuates* the sense, and is the formal cause of the act of sensation. Consequently it belongs wholly and entirely to the order of

[17] I find that in my previous article, while I denied that the disposition necessitating grace was an efficient cause, I omitted to state to which species of causality it really belongs. It must be assigned to *material* causality, like all dispositions which prepare the subject for the reception of the form. Here the form is grace; and the material cause or the subject is the soul fully prepared for the reception of grace, and, therefore, in the possession of that ultimate disposition which is a right and title necessitating grace.

[18] It must be distinguished from the material impression upon the organ; otherwise a dead body could experience sensation equally well with a living body.

knowledge. Further, because a sign imprints its image upon the sense, it conveys the knowledge of something else, by reason of a connection or relation which exists between the two things. Now this relation may be either natural or conventional; in other words, the connection which exists between the sign and that which it signifies, may arise out of the very nature of the two things, as, for instance, the connection between smoke and fire; or it may be due to the institution of some intelligent agent. In the former case we have natural signs, which of their own nature, and by virtue of their own natural operation, impart further knowledge to the mind; but in the latter the signs are arbitrary and conventional, and have their power of signifying, not from any intrinsic connection with the objects they represent, but from the fact that, having been arbitrarily chosen to represent certain objects, they are employed for that purpose in particular cases. Hence conventional signs (of which words form the most important class) are the instruments of intellectual agents for the communication of knowledge. They receive from one intellect a certain instrumental spiritual power or force, by means of which they are able to stimulate another intellect to activity and impart to it certain information. Now this spiritual power cannot be a physical quality inherent in the sensible sign, *e.g.*, in the material sound of a word. But it is an instrumental and consequently a transient quality or virtue which enables the sign to become the medium of communication between one intellect and another; and, therefore, it is nothing more or less than the actual institution or employment of that particular sensible object by an intelligent being for this particular purpose. This certainly belongs to the intentional and not to the physical order, for it has to do wholly with the intentions of the intellect and the order of knowledge.

But there are practical as well as speculative signs; signs, that is, which not only communicate knowledge, but also produce the knowledge of which they communicate. For just as the speculative intellect has its instruments to manifest its concepts, so, too, has the practical intellect *its* instruments to impose its practical decrees and ordinances. If the desired effect is something physical, the practical intellect employs the executive faculties to carry out

its mandate, and they in their turn make use of physical instruments. But if the effect to be produced is something belonging to the intentional order, such as the imposition of an obligation, the granting of jurisdiction, the bestowal of a title or dignity, appointment to an office, and the like, no physical change is required. For these intentional entities consist, in their essence, of an intellectual ordinance or decree of a superior, applied to and, as it were, permanently affixed to the object of the ordinance (until it is revoked). Instruments, however, are needed to convey and apply these ordinances, for they are of themselves immanent acts. These instruments are signs, which, since they themselves belong to the intentional order, may fitly be employed by the intellect to convey and execute its ordinances in the intentional order. As speculative signs, they notify the existence of this authoritative decision of the practical intellect, and in so doing they, as practical signs, affix it to its destined object, and thus cause in the object the effect which they signify. For example, the form of words by which a law is promulgated is also the instrument through which the law is imposed as obligatory upon the subjects of the State; in all contracts a written or spoken form of words becomes the instrument by means of which rights are transferred, titles of ownership acquired, etc.

Practical signs are therefore instruments belonging to the intentional order. For if their own proper operation belongs to the intentional order, the instrumental operation also must belong to it, for the action of the instrument cannot belong to two different orders of being at the same time. The twofold operation of the instrument is in reality one complete act, not two separate acts, and proceeds from one complete active power; and so, if the proper operation of the instrument is intentional, the instrumental operation must be the same. Besides, the proper operation of the instrument must contribute something to the effect, otherwise there would be no object in employing the instrument. But of what use would an instrument be whose proper operation was in the intentional order, and its instrumental operation and effect entirely physical? There would be no relation, no bond of union between the natural and the instrumental operations. The proper operation and natural effect of the instrument are really the basis

of the instrumental operation and the principal effect. The effect of the instrumental operation is a modification and elevation of the instrument's natural effect, and must therefore always belong to the same order, physical or intentional. Now, the Sacraments are practical signs, and as such are used by God as His instruments. Consequently, just as their proper operation of signifying belongs to the order of intentions, so also must their instrumental operation and their immediate effect. Hence, if the Sacraments produce a physical effect, it cannot be the immediate effect, and it can only happen in one of two ways: Either (1) the immediate intentional effect involves also something physical as its natural complement, as the wearing of a uniform is involved in enlistment in the army. This is the case in the sacramental character, which is primarily something intentional, viz., appointment to a special office in the service of God, which involves a physical mark or seal distinguishing the holders of that office from all the rest of God's intelligent creatures. Or (2) the immediate intentional effect is a disposition which gives a right or title to a further effect which is physical, so that the immediate cause of the intentional effect is the dispositive cause of the physical effect. Thus the Sacraments are the dispositive intentional causes of the physical effect of grace.

To show that this argument is in accordance with the teaching of St. Thomas, I will make three quotations from his later works. (1) *Qq. Dd. de Veritate*, q. 27, a. 4, ad 13:—"A sacrament of its own nature *signifies* or is capable of signifying that effect to the production of which it is ordained by God: and *thus it is a fit instrument, because the Sacraments cause by signifying*," *i. e.*, inasmuch as they are signs. (2) *Summa*, 3 p., q. 62, a. 4, ad 1:—"A spiritual power cannot reside in a corporeal thing as a permanent and complete power, as is proved from reason. But there is nothing to prevent a spiritual power being in a body instrumentally, *i. e.*, in so far as a material thing can be moved by a spiritual substance to produce some spiritual effect: thus in a material *word* there is a certain *spiritual force* capable of actuating the human intellect because it proceeds from an intellectual concept. And *it is in this manner that the Sacraments have a spiritual power*, inasmuch as they are ordained by God for the production of a spiritual effect." (3) *Summa*, 3 p., q. 62, a. 1, ad 2:—

"An instrument has two operations: one instrumental, according to which it acts, not by its own power, but by virtue of the principal agent; the other is the operation which belongs to it of its own nature; as, for example, an ax is able to cut because of its sharpness; but it can fashion a bench only as a tool in the hands of an artisan. But *it cannot act instrumentally except in the exercise of its own proper operation*, for by cutting it fashions the bench. Similarly, material sacraments, by means of the natural operation which they exercise upon the body which they touch, act instrumentally upon the soul by divine power," etc.[19]

It is true that St. Thomas generally uses physical examples to illustrate his teaching on the instrumentality of the Sacraments. This is only that he may more clearly bring out the reality of their instrumentality, for physical instruments are brought before our notice in a more concrete manner, and the fact of their instrumentality is more easily appreciated. St. Thomas does not always illustrate from physical instruments, as we see from the passage just quoted (2) from the *Summa* (3, q. 62, a. 4, ad 1), where he expressly compares the instrumental virtue of the sacraments to the intentional instrumentality of words.

2. The Council of Florence, in the *Decree pro Armenis*, teaches that "haec omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet, rebus tamquam materia, verbis tamquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia." For the validity of a sacrament, the mere material use of the matter and the pronunciation of the form is not sufficient, because the sign is not yet sacramental. It may be used in jest or mockery, or perchance a newly ordained priest is desirous of practising himself in the sacred rite. Something more, then, is required to make the sign a sacrament; and the decree of the Council tells us that it is the intention of the minister. For in order that the sign may become sacramental, it is necessary that it be brought into relation with the institution of the sacrament by Christ, or, so to say, that it receive the investiture of the institution of Christ. This is done when it is employed by a competent minister who has the intention of doing that which

[19] See also, *De Veritate*, q. 27, a. 4, *in corpore*.

Christ instituted.[20] The sacrament is then perfect and complete, and nothing more is required for its validity. The sacramental sign therefore receives its instrumental efficacy as regards grace from the intention of the minister, who thus brings it into relation with, and within the scope of, the institution of Christ; just as the instrumental signifying power of words is derived from the institution of men who employ certain words to manifest certain concepts. Therefore, the elevation of the sign to the sacramental order is entirely within the order of intentions, since its adequate cause is the institution of Christ, which is itself intentional. Consequently the sacramental virtue and efficacy of the sign is purely intentional. Moreover, if it were physical, we should not have a perfect sacrament, given only the three elements mentioned by the Council, matter, form, and intention; for the physical power of causing grace, which should be the most important constituent of the sacrament, is contained in none of them. The matter and form of themselves possess no sacramental virtue at all, whether physical or intentional, and when they are united with the intention of the minister, they receive, as we have shown, an intentional, not a physical, efficiency. If, then, we grant that the sacramental efficacy is intentional, the Council's analysis of a sacrament is most exact, for the operative power of the sacrament is included and implied in the intention of the minister.

This is the teaching of St. Thomas in the *Summa*, 3 p., q. 62, a. 4, ad 3: "The sacrament received spiritual efficacy *from the benediction of Christ*, and because it is employed sacramentally by the minister;" and the Angelic Doctor then quotes St. Augustine to the same effect. Also in the *Summa contra Gentiles*, l. 4, c. 56, he says, "It is not unfitting that sensible and material things should be ministers of spiritual health, because they are, as it were, instruments of our incarnate and crucified God. Now an instrument does not operate by its own natural virtue, but by virtue of the principal agent by whom it is employed to produce the effect. Thus, therefore, these sensible things cause spiritual healing, not

[20] I must not be understood to maintain that the efficacy of the Sacraments is *intentional*, precisely because it depends upon the *intention* of the minister. That would be a mere play upon words, for the intentional order is the order of the intentions of the intellect, not of the will.

by their own natural properties, but *by reason of the institution of Christ Himself, from which they derive their instrumental virtue.*"

3. Since the Sacraments cause grace dispositively, if they were physical causes, their immediate effect, antecedent to grace, would necessarily be physical. But in three, at least, of the sacraments, Penance, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony, it is impossible to imagine any physical effect intervening between the outward sign and grace. Is the bond of marriage physical, or the right which the judicial sentence of absolution gives to the remission of sins, or the committal of the dying Christian to the mercy of God through the prayer of the Church? Physical causality appears impossible in these cases; their causality, like their immediate effect, clearly belongs to the intentional order. And since all the sacraments have the same generic nature, we may legitimately conclude that the causality of all is intentional.

Hence, St. Thomas[21] attributes even to the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist an intentional virtue, differing in no wise from that of the other sacraments: "Since the words (of consecration) are pronounced in the person of Christ, they derive their instrumental virtue *from his mandate* (*ex ejus mandato*)." It is difficult to see what *physical* virtue the words can receive from the command of Christ: "Do this for a commemoration of me." I say "*even* to the Holy Eucharist," because in this sacrament at least the doctrine of intentional causality would seem to break down, for the immediate effect, the title to grace, which is the Real Presence, is something physical, and must be produced by a physical cause. But we must apply to this case the general principles which St. Thomas lays down[22] with regard to the agency of instruments in the divine operations. The Holy Eucharist has this peculiar to itself that a miraculous change of matter takes place. Therefore, according to those principles, since God alone is the principal agent of miraculous effects, the created instrument cannot co-operate perfectively in the miracle, but only dispositively, by presenting or applying to nature the divine command ("*ut per eas quodammodo naturæ præsentetur divinum præceptum*," or "*imperium*"), as St. Thomas says, in *De Potentia*, q. 6, a. 4; which is certainly intentional causality. Indeed it is precisely the instrumental

[21] 3 p. q. 78, a. 4.

[22] See previous article, January, p. 44.

causality of a practical sign, which we have described in the first argument of this section. In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, there is a double dispositive causality. The outward sign, by an intentional efficacy, causes in the bread and wine a disposition necessitating the conversion of their substance into the Body and Blood of Christ, of which conversion God alone is the physical cause, and the Body and Blood of Christ really present under the species, and received in Holy Communion, are in the recipient a title to the grace of the sacrament.

So also, although there is something physical in the characters of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Order, still they are not, primarily and principally, physical, but intentional. For they consist essentially in the appointment to certain public offices in the Christian religion, and, therefore, have attached to them a physical quality to mark the possessor of the office as an instrument of Christ. But it is the appointment to the office, and not the physical seal, that is the title to grace; in fact, even if these sacraments did not cause any physical mark on the soul, the office which they confer would always be a claimant to grace, just as it is now. Consequently, since appointment to an office is something belonging to the order of the intentions of the intellect, an intentional virtue suffices to cause that which is the title to the infusion of grace, even in the sacraments that imprint a character.

To sum up. We have considered various theological principles that have reference to the Sacraments; the fact that they are instruments in the divine operation of justification; the doctrine that a valid sacrament does not necessarily confer grace, while it necessarily contains it; the fact that the Sacraments are practical signs, while they do not signify the bestowal of grace immediately, but only mediately; the doctrine and practice of the Church concerning the repetition of sacraments; and, finally, the doctrine of sacramental revival; and all have led us to the same conclusion, that the Sacraments connot be the immediate and perfective causes of grace, but only dispositive causes. Likewise, arguing principally from the intentional character and efficacy of a sign as such, we conclude that the Sacraments are not physical, but intentional, dispositive causes of grace.

C. J. CRONIN, D.D.

English College, Rome.

CHURCH BUILDING.—IX.

Principles of Ornamentation.

THE love of ornament is natural to man. It is as ancient and as widespread as the human race itself. As soon as they had satisfied their most urgent physical needs, men always and everywhere looked around them for what appealed to their sense of beauty; and if it was of a kind that could be appropriated, they attached it to their persons or to the things they used, or set it up before their eyes to be seen at all times. Endowed, besides, with the power of imitation, by means of lines and colors they wrought rude images of real or imaginary objects on their primitive tools and weapons. The arms of the savage, the oars with which he propelled his canoe, even his flint implements, were often covered with curiously elaborate and not ungraceful designs, as may be seen in the collections of our museums. This love of ornament, this habit of adding beauty to utility, has grown steadily with civilization itself. To-day it has become so much a part of our existence that we obey it almost unconsciously in regard to everything we use. There is not a corner of our habitations, not a piece of our furniture, not one of the many objects we handle all day long, that does not exhibit care and labor expended on making it something more than merely useful.

This applies in a special manner to structures raised for public and permanent purposes. At all times it has been the aim of those who planned them to make them not only as serviceable but as beautiful as circumstances would permit. Above all, when it was question of erecting a place of worship, nothing possible was neglected to make it pleasing and impressive. As a consequence, the pagan temples and the Christian churches have been the most beautiful monuments the world has seen. But although much of their beauty was due to their constructive elements and the happy proportions of their masses, yet much more was added by the variety and richness of the ornaments lavished upon them. We read in the Bible how David and Solomon accumulated vast riches to adorn the temple; *gold for vessels of gold, and silver for vessels of silver, onyx stones and stones like alabaster, and of divers colors, and all manner of precious stones and marble in abundance.*

Nor would they have the workmanship inferior to the materials, even though it had to be sought for outside the land. *Send me*, wrote Solomon to the King of Tyre, *send me a skilful man that knoweth how to work in gold and in silver, in purple, in scarlet, and in blue, and that hath skill in engraving, that he may work with the artificers that I have with me in Judæa and Jerusalem.*[1] Such has been the spirit of the Catholic Church at all times. Ever since she emerged from the catacombs her heart has been set on making her places of worship as worthy as possible of God and of His Saints. From every part of the world she has gathered in what was most precious and best suited to adorn her sanctuaries; the most gifted among her children have come in succession at her bidding and deposited before her altars the immortal products of their artistic genius; in a word, through Christian ages our churches have never ceased to be enriched with the best of what was within the power of man to offer.

It is the ambition of every true priest to take up and have his share in transmitting that noble tradition. Like the Psalmist, he loves the beauty of the house of God: *Domine, dilexi decorum domus tuae.* Be it stately or humble, his joy is to be always adding something to its beauty and making it ever more attractive to his people. There are few pastors to whom this joy is denied. To build a church falls to the lot of only a few: to improve and adorn the one in which he ministers is within the reach of every priest in care of souls. For this, of course, as well as for building, he is dependent in a great measure on those who plan or execute the work. But, without being architect or decorator, he may frequently be able to make useful suggestions, and many important particulars will ultimately depend on his judgment. Happily, with a little industry, he can learn enough to follow intelligently what is being done, and to interfere judiciously. The books already recommended will help him considerably, and others no less useful will be mentioned as we proceed. On the present occasion we must be satisfied to point out the leading aspects of the subject, and to enunciate certain general principles which, though simple and obvious, are often lost sight of, and, where realized, suffice to solve many a perplexing problem.

[1] I Paral., 29, and II, 2 : 7.

Setting aside for the present every other manner of adornment suited to churches, we are only concerned here with what devolves upon the sculptor and the painter. We speak of them together, because their respective spheres and purposes are the same: the representation of objects, real or imaginary, the one by salient forms, the other by color. There are principles, therefore, which apply equally to both, and to these we shall confine ourselves in the present paper.

I.—Decorative Elements.

The designs by which the artist appeals to the æsthetic sense are of three kinds: simple lines; abstract, or fanciful forms; imitations of real objects.

Lines, as we have already seen, may of themselves be pleasing in architecture. They are susceptible of conveying an impression of grace or of energy, of motion or of rest. Single, their effect may be insignificant; but if multiplied, their power of expression is felt at once, as may be seen in the grooved shaft of a Doric or Corinthian column. In nothing is this more noticeable than in the familiar ornament of mouldings.

Mouldings deserve the special attention of the student. They meet the eye everywhere, alone or in combination with other ornaments, and are almost invariably pleasing. To the inobservant they all seem very much alike, but the trained eye detects at once the greatest differences between them. In fact, notwithstanding their seeming simplicity, they offer an endless variety of forms. Each style of architecture, Egyptian, Greek, Roman; each phase of the mediæval Romanesque and Gothic had its characteristic mouldings, always in keeping with the style and unsuited to any other. To select or to design the most appropriate kind of moulding for each individual purpose is one of the tasks which require most judgment and taste in the architect or the decorator. The best way to get a knowledge of the subject is to study the elements of the Greek mouldings and their principal combinations. They may be found in any elementary book on architecture, and having once mastered them, the student can easily trace them through Roman architecture and watch their various transformations in the styles of a later period.

Abstract Forms.—Such are all geometrical figures, circles, squares, polygons of various kinds. They have all the charm of symmetry, and although alone and separate they possess little decorative power, when multiplied and combined they become attractive and pleasing, just as the simplest flowers do when used as borders or clustered into thick-set beds. Hence the love and abundant use of them at every period. The decorative patterns which we meet at every turn are, when closely looked into, found to consist of designs evolved from such elements.

Besides these there are other decorative forms not subject to mathematical laws, yet not imitative of anything in nature, but rather suggestive of, and doubtless suggested by, some of the expressive forms of the visible world; waving lines, graceful curves, such as may be seen in the branch of a tree or the outline of a flower or of a leaf. These the artist notices, enjoys, and embodies after a fashion in his designs.

Imitative Forms.—The representation of real objects is the highest form of decoration, that which implies the most skill in the artist and gives most pleasure to the spectator. The number and variety of the things that may be thus represented for purposes of adornment is simply endless. But all are not equally available. For instance, the image of products of human industry is never beautiful; yet it may be admissible in decorative work as a symbol. Thus in a church representations may be allowed of the sacred vessels, the censor, the cross in all conceivable shapes and combinations, because these and all like images recall doctrines and memories both welcome and helpful to the Christian worshiper.

But it is chiefly from animated nature that the artist gathers images with which to adorn the house of God. He copies the foliage and flowers of shrubs and trees, the delicate and graceful plants that creep along their rugged trunks and cling to them for support. He knows that these things which the eye dwells upon with pleasure under the open sky, it loves to meet reproduced by human art within the walls of a sacred edifice. He remembers besides that they appeal sometimes to the soul as symbols of things higher than themselves. Palms, for example, laurels, lilies, roses, the sheaf of wheat and the vine with its

branches, its tendrils, and its fruit, all are full of mystic meaning for the Christian.

The animal world, too, supplies the artist with decorative subjects, and though less suited to sacred than to secular purposes, they abound as symbols all through the religious work of the Middle Ages. The artists of that period delighted to reproduce not only the animals of the Bible, but also many others, real or fantastic, familiarly referred to by contemporary writers as types of the virtues and vices of men.[2] Birds were special favorites, most of all the dove, that beautiful symbol of the Divine Spirit and of the Christian soul.[3] Finally, highest and noblest and most beautiful of all, comes the human form. But of this, on account of its importance, we must speak more at length later on.

Such then, in brief, are the decorative elements with which peoples ancient and modern have adorned their public monuments and their homes: and it is by them that the modern artist still continues to beautify whatever he touches. Each people applied them in its own way; each architectural style has its characteristic ornaments, and with a little attention the student will find it easy to recognize them. The Greek ornaments were few, and simple, but exquisite in taste and arrangement. With rectangular lines the Greek artists formed their *frets*, or square mouldings curiously interlaced and losing themselves in each other; and their *guilloche*,

[2] Curious volumes, called *bestiaries* (*bestiaria*), were written at the time, describing on the authority of Aristotle or Pliny or of pure legend, all kinds of animals with whose habits, real and supposed, all manner of moral lessons were connected.

[3] It is in connection with the latter that Ruskin, in his *Stories of Venice*, writes as follows: "In the power of flight in their wings and in the tender purposes of their flight you hear also in your Father's book. To the Church flying from her enemies into the desolate wilderness there were indeed given two wings as of a great eagle. But the weary saint of God looking forward to his home in the calm of eternal peace, prays rather: *O that I had wings like a dove, for then I should flee away and be at rest.* And of these wings and this mind of hers this is what reverent science should teach you; first, with what parting of plume and what soft pressure and rhythmic beating of divided air she reaches that miraculous swiftness of undubious motion, compared with which the tempest is slow and the arrow uncertain; and secondly, what clue there is visible or conceivable to thought of man by which to her living conscience her distant home is felt afar beyond the horizon, and the straight path through concealing clouds and over trackless lands made plain to her desire and her duty by the finger of God."

or plaited bands appearing and disappearing in regular succession. From the vegetable world they borrowed little beyond the *acanthus leaf*, the *palmette* or extended palm leaf, and the *honeysuckle*. Their mouldings, already beautiful, they enriched with the familiar *eggs* and *darts*, while their smallest round mouldings were carved into strings of *oves* and *pearls*. These ornaments they reproduced indefinitely, without ever exhibiting any tendency to add to or to alter them.

Not so the Romans. While appropriating Greek architecture bodily, to its decorative elements they added many others: wreaths of oak, laurel or bay leaf, festoons composed of foliage, fruits and flowers, trophies, scrolls encasing fantastic creatures. All these they spread with a lavish hand over their public monuments through the length and breadth of the empire. Byzantine architecture suddenly drops the whole system. It brings little new ornament with it, but that little is easily recognized, and is very beautiful in its conventional treatment of foliage and in its scroll work. Early Romanesque borrowed its decorative elements almost entirely from Rome and Byzantium; but gradually it went forth and gathered in others from surrounding nature. The movement, once originated, led in the Gothic period to a complete emancipation from the traditions of earlier ages. The acanthus leaf, everywhere in Roman and Byzantine architecture, disappears altogether, and its place is filled with a rich variety of foliage, buds and flowers of the kind that met the eye of the artist wherever he turned—the vine leaf and the oak, the trefoil and the strawberry, the buttercup and the water lily. Artists, henceforth free, confined themselves for a time to simpler forms and a more summary imitation; but as they grew in dexterity they chose subjects more difficult to imitate; foliage of more uneven surface and more intricate outline. It was no longer for them so much a matter of decoration as of exhibition of skill, the sure sign of a period of decay. The Renaissance came and swept it all away, bringing back the old Roman ornaments, and giving rise to many developments entirely new, to which it gives its name. Each period and each country introduced peculiar features, of much interest to the architect or to the professional decorator, but in which the ordinary student might easily lose himself. If, however, his curiosity is awakened

in that direction, it will find full satisfaction in the *Grammar of Ornament*, by Owen Jones; *Principles of Ornament*, by James Ward; *La Grammaire de l'Ornement*, by Charles Blanc; *The Seven Lamps*, and *Stones of Venice*, by Ruskin.

II.—Place of Ornament.

1. The purpose of ornament, its only purpose, is to beautify what it is applied to. But it may fail in the attempt. When injudiciously employed it positively detracts from the beauty of what it was meant to adorn, by altering its character or by destroying its appropriate expression. In such cases it should simply be put aside. Bad taste lavishes ornament, good taste is instinctively sparing of it.

2. Ornament is introduced to be seen. It should therefore be placed where it may be oftenest and best seen. It is more appropriate in cities than in the country, in the interior of buildings where people spend long hours more than on the outside which is generally seen only in passing.

3. There are parts of a church on which the eye naturally rests, and these have a special claim to be decorated; on the outside, the façade, the towers; on the inside, the sanctuary.

4. The salient angles of a wall, of a pier, or of an arch are unpleasant when bare. They need to be smoothed and enriched, and this is done chiefly by the application of mouldings, their proper ornament.

5. Points of junction where the different structural elements meet seem also to call for decoration of some kind. It is in answer to this call that a column is connected with the ground by its base and to the entablature by its capital; that a wall is adorned exteriorly by a cornice or something equivalent where it meets the roof, and interiorly by heavy mouldings where it reaches the ceiling.

6. Finally large smooth surfaces,—walls, pediments, shafts of pillars, and the like lend themselves so naturally to decoration that they seem to spread themselves out to the artist, inviting him to enrich them with the products of his genius.

III.—Laws of Ornament.

They are mainly the same as those laid down for architecture itself. We may mention:

1. **The Law of Unity.**—This means, first of all, that the same style of decoration should be maintained throughout. To borrow ornaments from every style and use them indiscriminately is a practice only too common, but always most unpleasant to the educated eye. It is like mingling all kinds of writing in the same literary composition. A work of art represents a definite conception; it is meant to produce a given impression; to this and to no other should the style of decoration correspond.

The law of unity leads to the use of the same decorative forms or patterns right through the work. But, although the frequent repetition of a design, if pleasing, is by no means unwelcome, yet, when carried too far, it begets monotony. Hence, side by side with unity, stands the law of variety. Variety, of its nature, awakens and sustains the interest of the beholder. The unvarying repetition of the same ornaments in Greek architecture is redeemed only by its extreme beauty. The abundance, on the other hand, of the decorative forms used by mediæval artists constituted one of the most interesting features of their work. Its main lines produce unity of effect almost as fully as those of the ancients, but in the decorative details variety is everywhere. Windows are of the same size, but the filling is different; columns and piers correspond exactly to each other, but their capitals differ in design and in the foliage that adorns them.

Repetition again is relieved by alternation of ornaments, or by breaks introduced at regular intervals, and forming a sort of rhythm like that of poetry. Again, contrast of forms in the ornament itself, such as a combination of square and rounded designs, sharp curves associated with flat ones help to counteract the effect of iteration and sameness.

Symmetry, finally, *i. e.*, the regular correspondence of similar parts at either side of a given line, may be reckoned among the applications of the law of unity. There is nothing the eye seeks more instinctively or demands more imperatively in decorative work than symmetry.

2. **Law of Subordination.**—(*a*) In architecture ornament is but an adjunct; usefulness comes first and should never be sacrificed in any degree. Any kind of ornament, consequently, that is easily broken off or spoiled, or that weakens what it adorns and demands an inconvenient amount of care to use it with safety, or is simply in the way, such ornament is wrong and should be put aside or modified.

(*b*) The character of the ornament should be in keeping with the character of the place. Many ornaments are suitable in private or secular buildings which are obviously unfitted for a sacred edifice. Features that suit a small chapel may be entirely out of harmony with the solemn and stately expression of a great cathedral.

(*c*) Ornament finally should be kept in subordination to the main lines of the structure and to its dominant character. This law invariably observed in the most flourishing periods of art has been almost invariably departed from in periods of decay, each sculptor or painter being concerned to give prominence to his own work regardless of the effect as a whole.

3. **Law of Measure and Proportion.**—Because ornament is good it does not follow that the more of it there is the better. When not held in check by taste ornament develops into sumptuousness and pompous display. It is thus that Greek art degenerated among the Romans, and the same thing is happening every day where money abounds and tastes are still unrefined. What is yet worse is the practice of aiming at rich effects by cheap imitations.

As to proportion, it has to prevail everywhere in ornament as it is found in nature itself. There must be proportion of size or of pattern between the ornament and what it adorns, proportion between the different decorative forms or designs employed, proportion of the different parts of the same design, etc.

4. **Law of Treatment.**—Ornament, as we have said, often consists in the imitation of natural objects. But there are two methods of imitation: one literal, as it were, the other conventional. Literal imitation means a close, faithful reproduction of the model with all its accidental peculiarities. In itself this is always pleasing, but generally unsuited to decorative purposes,

ornament having to bend its lines to those of the object adorned, and to assume something of the regularity of geometrical figures. Hence the necessity of modifying its forms, of suppressing details while preserving a general likeness and all the characteristic expression and beauty of the model. This is conventional imitation, the only one followed when art was at its best, in Egypt, in Greece, in Rome; in the art of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Thus the acanthus leaf or the honeysuckle of the Greeks is never to be met with in nature as we find it on their capitals. The decorative flora of the Middle Ages, though often strikingly imitative in its general features, always remains conventional. And so with the rest. Though always recognizable, and losing nothing of its expression or of its beauty, all is transformed to accommodate itself to its decorative purposes.

Another reason for substituting the conventional for the natural treatment may arise from the position of the ornament. When seen at a distance the minor details are lost to the eye, and the general forms are more or less blurred. As a consequence the artist when drawing what is far removed from the spectator, simplifies his design, drops the details and emphasizes the more salient features.

These are some of the principal laws of ornament. The student will find them exemplified in the architectural drawings he may have occasion to examine, and will see them practically applied in hundreds of specimens around him. Even in their abstract shape they may help him to form a correct judgment of the plans of decoration which may be submitted to him for approval. As a rule he will find it safer to be guided by the taste of the architect or decorator than by his own. If, however, he has serious misgivings he may subject the drawings to some competent person or contrive to see some work in which similar designs have already been carried out.

J. HOGAN.

St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

LUKE DELMEGE:—PART II. ILLUMINATION.[1]

XXVIII.—Mary of Magdala.

IN the home of the Good Shepherd the religion of our Lord reaches its culmination. No wonder that the favorite representation of Christ in catacombs and elsewhere for three hundred years was this of the yearning and merciful Saviour. How well those early Christians knew His spirit, when they placed a kid, and not a lamb, on His shoulders! "I came not to call the just, but sinners." Yes! charity first and then the Crucifixion—the mystery of suffering. And here in the city of the Violated Treaty, under its crumbling, historic walls, and just outside its ruins, nestled such a home. You might pass through the city a hundred times and not know that such an institution was there. You might visit the historic bridge, and the Treaty Stone, and never know that here also was a place where the might of the Lord was visibly triumphant. You might hear elsewhere of the miracles of Christianity—here you could see them. You might read of battles, fought, won, or lost, around the Two Standards: but here you can see the bleeding and wounded *vivandières* in Satan's army snatched from the battlefield, and sheltered in the camp of Christ. And here, if you had faith, that is, if you opened your eyes, and brushed aside the film of habit, you might see miracles, and saints, and prodigies, such as you read of in the Gospel, or in mediæval times, when perhaps you wished you had been born then. So, at least, thought Father Tracey, who was never harsh in his judgments, except when he deplored that crass stupidity of men, that will not see what is under their eyes.

"Nonsense, child," he would say to Margery, "to talk about the age of miracles as past. Here are miracles; and saints, as great as ever were canonized."

Then he would repent of such rashness, and correct himself.

"Of course, I don't mean—that is, my dear—I don't mean to say that the Church should canonize all my little saints that die. But you know—I mean that our Lord will—that is, I suppose, you know—my dear—"

[1] *Copyrighted*, 1901, by the American Ecclesiastical Review.

"Of course, Father. That is, we, poor nuns, have no chance with your saints."

"No, no. I don't mean that. But, you know, you are all very good; but there are different degrees of sanctity—some Apostles, some Doctors—"

"Yes. But Mary Magdalen is the next to the Sacred Heart, just a little outside the Blessed Virgin, and she is dragging up all her little saints with her? Isn't that what you mean?"

"I'm not sure, my dear. The Imitation says, that we must not make comparisons, you know."

"Yes. But tell me now, suppose you had your choice of a place in Heaven amongst the band that 'follow the Lamb, whithersoever He goeth,' and sing that incommunicable canticle; or of a place with Magdalen and her wounded following, which would you take?"

"That's a hard question, my dear. But, to tell the truth, my dear, I'd be far more comfortable with the latter."

"I knew it," said Margery, exultantly. "I've won ten rosaries from Mechthildes."

But, whatever be said of the different beatitudes of Heaven, it is quite certain that living amongst the rescued sheep was not all beatitude on earth. Sometimes a poor soul would struggle in the arms of the Shepherd to get back to the horrors of the battlefield; would dream of gaslamps, and the midnight, and the fierce, exultant madness of sin. And, sometimes, there would be depression and even despair, as the awful visions of the past arose before some poor soul; and the dreadful suggestion would paralyze every effort at reparation: How can I ever enjoy heaven, when so many souls, lost by my ill-doing, are tortured in hell? These were hard trials for Father Tracey.

"No use, Father, I *must* go!"

"Have we been unkind, my dear? Or, is there something else you could wish for?"

"Oh, no, no, Father dear; but I *must* go!"

"Well, dear, don't act hastily. This, you know, is a temptation from the Evil One. Go in, and say a little prayer to the Sacred Heart; and I'll send Sister Mary to you."

"No! no! don't! I won't see *her*. She'd *make* me stay. And I must go!"

"Well, sure, there's time enough. Go in, child, and pray."

He, dear saint, had great faith in prayer. But he believed the prayers of Sister Mary to be invincible. Was it not Sister Mary's prayers that had saved so many souls from perdition? Was it not Sister Mary's prayers that drove the evil spirits, howling in dismay, from the deathbed of Allua? Was she not the custodian of the King's secret, who could do as she pleased with the King's treasures? And never yet did a poor penitent, eager to fly unto the dread attraction of the world, hear the voice of Sister Mary, but her eyes were opened and she saw beneath her feet the yellow flames curling up from the abyss?

And who was Sister Mary, or to give her her full title, who was Sister Mary of Magdala? Well, a poor penitent, too, who had sought refuge here from the world. The report was that she had been a great sinner. Even hardened women spoke of her past life with a vague hint at horrors; and, sometimes, when Sister Mary pressed too hard on a relapsing sinner, and spoke of hell, it was broadly suggested that she had sent a good deal of fuel to the fire.

"That handsome face of yours, if all were known, drew many to drink and hell."

And Sister Mary did not contradict, but only bowed her head meekly, and prayed and argued ever so strongly for the wayward and the tempted.

It would appear, too, that she had been a lady of very high rank, and had toppled down from circle to circle of the Inferno, until God took pity on her and brought her here. And here she developed such sanctity that the community and her sister penitents were bewildered; but all agreed that there was a saint—a real, downright, heroic saint—amongst them. But by far the most surprised and bewildered amongst this sacred community of nuns and penitents was the confessor, Father Tracey. He did not know what to make of it. He was confused, humbled, nervous, ashamed. The first time he saw this young penitent was at a "play." For this glorious Sisterhood used up every human means that talent or the divine ingenuity of charity could suggest to wean away these poor souls from the fierce attractions of sin and the world. And so there were plays, and concerts, and dramatic entertain-

ments, and *tableaux vivants*, and all kinds of innocent dissipation for the "penitents." And their harmless amusements were very successful in cheating the poor souls of the more deadly draughts of sin, until grace and habit finally triumphed. Well, at one of these entertainments, Sister Mary of Magdala was chief actor. She personated a fine lady of the world, suffering from nerves, and in consultation with a lady specialist. It was very amusing, and the audience were in convulsions. Venerable old penitents, who had done their fifty years of purgatory in this asylum; young penitents, fresh from the pollution of the city and with the remnants of rural innocence still clinging to them; dark, gloomy souls, the special prey of the tempter; and the gentle Sisterhood, presiding over all,—all yielded to the irresistible merriment. Sister Mary had doffed the penitent's dress and was clad in the finery of the well-dressed woman of the world. It became her well. She was every inch a lady, and all the sweetness and delicacy of her early training shone through the absurdity of the part she was playing.

"Ladies from the city, my dear?" whispered Father Tracey to Margery. "How good of them to come in and amuse these poor girls!"

"No; they're our own children," whispered Margery.

"But that grand young lady, my dear? why, she's fit for a palace."

"That's Mary of Magdala," said Margery, smiling. "She's now a great saint; but they say she was awful."

But, oh! the pity of it, when the performers disappeared amidst the plaudits of the audience and the rough criticisms of some poor creatures, and immediately reappeared in the penitents' costume—blue dress and mantella, and high, white Norman cap—and took their places amongst the inmates again. Father Tracey was choking with emotion, as he watched that young girl, disrobed of her natural dress and clad in the strange livery that hid, and yet hinted at, unspeakable shame. And she so calm, so unconcerned, without a blush at the frightful transformation, and accepting so gratefully the rough congratulations from her sister penitent, as she sat on the lowest bench and lifted up the beads of old Sister Paul and toyed with them like a child.

"I tell you, my dear," said Father Tracey, "that if Heaven is

the place for those who become little children, that poor child will be at home there."

And the good old priest became frightened at Sister Mary of Magdala. He almost began to think he had been mistaken in not taking charge of the nuns instead. And when he recognized her voice in the confessional he got a violent fit of coughing and turned away his head and pulled up his old cassock over his knees, and, instead of the long, fervent exhortation he usually addressed to his saints, with such emotion that he set the most hardened aflame with the love of God, he only muttered, with averted head:

"Yes, yes, to be sure, my dear, to be sure."

Margery and he used to have long spiritual conferences on this subject.

"I'm sure I don't know what to do, my dear," he would say. "Can you help me? Isn't there a book written by a good, holy man, called Scaramelli, or something like it, for the direction of these holy souls?"

"There is, indeed, Father. But, sure you have knowledge and inspiration enough for these poor penitents."

"Me? I don't know anything, my dear. I was, you know, what they call *minus habens* in Maynooth."

"What's that, Father?"

"Well, it's the very opposite of what your great, clever brother was."

Margery shuddered.

"He was at the head of his class; I, at the foot of mine. Why, I was 'doctored' twice."

"Doctored? O, I am so glad!"

"Yes, my dear,—'doctored.' That is I was compelled twice to read the same treatises for a second year."

"And wasn't that good, Father?"

"Yes, my dear; but it meant awful stupidity. Somehow I could not understand things. I used to look at those books and papers; but my head would swim round and round, and I used to see the words without understanding what they meant. Why, it was the wonder of the whole college that they ordained me at all."

"I suppose so, Father," said Margery, trying to keep back her tears.

"It was, my dear. And I suppose I'd be digging potatoes to-day, which would be my proper vocation, but for old Dr. Whitehead. They all agreed that I should go. They said I'd disgrace the Church, which was quite true. And the senior professor of theology said that I knew no more about theology than a cow about a holiday. But poor Dr. Whitehead asked, could I manage to get up the ceremonies of the Mass? and they shook their heads. 'Well, I'll teach him,' he said; 'and he must be a priest.' May the Lord be kind to him—and—forgive him."

"Well," said Margery, "and did you learn them?"

"In a kind of way, my dear. Sometimes I do be puzzled; and I look up, when I should look down; and, at the Conference, the Bishop never asks me anything, lest I should make a fool of myself."

"I'm afraid you want Scaramelli badly, Father. It was well for you, you didn't get charge of us."

"Ah, that was out of the question, my dear. And the Bishop saw it the moment I hinted at the thing. I'd have the all of ye half-cracked by this time."

"And so you think Mary of Magdala is a saint?"

"Think? I know it. And suppose now, I should misdirect that grand soul, or fail to lift it upwards, what a frightful responsibility! I'm thinking of asking the Bishop to remove me, and—"

"You'll do nothing of the kind," said Margery, thoroughly frightened. "You'll just stay where you are."

"Perhaps so, my dear. But I'll tell you now what you could do for me. You could read up all about St. Catherine of Siena, and Blessed Angela of Foligno, and Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, and let me know what their confessors used do. Or, I'll tell you. If you'd be so good as to write to your brother (he's a very distinguished theologian, you know), and pretend nothing, but ask a few questions, which I will put to you from time to time, perhaps—"

"The very thing," said Margery. Adding in her own mind, "'Tis a direct inspiration."

"Then, you know, I could feel sure that I was supported by sound Catholic theology; and I couldn't go very far astray."

"I will," said Margery. "And so they were going to turn you out of Maynooth?"

"So they were, my dear, but for Dr. Whitehead."

"And you would be now digging potatoes?"

"Yes, my dear, in a flannel waistcoat, and hobnailed boots."

"H'm. A decided improvement, I should say, on your present wardrobe. At least they'd keep out the rain."

And Sister Mary of Magdala was quite unconscious that she was exciting such interest; but went around in her penitent's garb, and washed and scrubbed, and ironed, and did all kinds of menial offices for the aged and the sick, and took gratefully their awkward gratitude.

"God bless you, alanna!" or, "God bless you, Mary, and forgive you, and forgive us all, for all we ever done against His Holy and Blessed Name!"

And they wondered, poor souls, in their own dull way, at the wonderful skill of the Divine Artist, who could raise this spirit of sweetness, this lily of light, out of the sordid and reeking refuse of the regretful past.

Meanwhile, Dr. Wilson had advertised all over England for the missing Barbara; and had even employed private detectives to find out the convent in which she was hidden. A foolish thing, for if Barbara had done God's will in entering religion, as she had said, there was little use in fighting against God; and, if it were not God's will, then Barbara would very soon find her way home. But the doctor was not well acquainted with such things. So he spent quite a little fortune in the vain quest. He was helped a good deal in his resolution by a remark dropped by that excellent lady, Mrs. Wenham, who, having returned to Dublin, had called for a double purpose—to visit the Wilsons formally, and to consult the doctor professionally. For, alas! that we should have to relate it, the beautiful and accomplished Mrs. Wenham, Circe and Siren, was but mortal; and the dread forerunners of death were playing suspiciously around that frail complexity of charms which had sent more than one fool to destruction.

Her visit to the drawing-room was short. The eternal plaint of the mother's heart was wearisome. It was all Louis! Louis! and the woman of the world, with all her contempt for the pretty little puppet, would just prefer that he should be allowed to sleep in peace. It was monstrous that these ghosts of memories, and

memories of ghosts, should be summoned up by the heart of a foolish mother at a pleasant morning call.

"It is quite a seance of spiritualists," she complained to her muff. "She'll ask me to summon this little idiot from Hades."

"I beg pardon," she said sweetly to the sorrowing mother, "does not your religion afford you some consolation in your bereavement?"

"It does, of course," said the weeper. "But it cannot bring Louis back."

"But you can pray, can you not, for—what's this the expression is—for the eternal repose of his soul?"

"Of course," said the mother. "And I have prayed. Indeed, I have. But death is death, and judgment."

Mrs. Wenham rose hastily. Here were those dreadful words again—always connected with these people. Death! Judgment! and at a morning call!

She entered the doctor's study. Here it was Barbara! Barbara! Had she seen her? Did she know her? Was there ever the faintest clue to her whereabouts? And the father's eyes pleaded piteously with the strange woman.

"Yes," she said, "Miss Wilson had called on her at a very unseasonable hour, and had appeared rather excited and disturbed in her mind. She spoke in a rather rambling manner; and appeared hardly able to control herself. She would not like to say that Miss Wilson was quite demented—but—"

It was quite clear that Miss Wilson had not entered a convent, or that she would be soon sent home.

"I thought," said Mrs. Wenham, "that it was the highest ambition of Roman Catholics to see their children in religion? Now, I assure you, I have often thought that I should so like to be a nun. I have seen such pretty pictures of them,—at the hospital, kneeling to the cross, singing their hymns; and they looked so pretty—such lovely faces, turned upwards to the skies—such peace, such happiness, to which we, poor women of the world, are strangers!"

"Let us change the subject," said the doctor. "You wished to consult me?"

Yes. And the consultation went on. And lo! as a result, the pretty nun faces vanished, and a grim death's head appeared,

floating through the eyes, and in the words of that horrid doctor. And she besought him, implored him to reconsider his verdict. So young, and the world so bright!

"I regret to say, Mrs. Wenham, that everything you tell me seems to confirm my judgment."

And Mrs. Wenham wept. Death and Judgment seemed to follow this family as footmen.

The Canon, too, was deeply interested. He had written piteous letters to great ecclesiastics in England. He had always written on his crested notepaper with the family arms and motto, *Sans tâche!* and he signed himself "Maurice Canon Murray." He would have given a good deal to be able to add Archdeacon, or Dean, of X—. But that was not to be, yet awhile. He received, after some delay, very courteous replies; but there was no news of Barbara. If she had entered an English convent it could hardly have escaped the notice of the authorities. At last, one day a letter came from the south of England, stating that a young lady, answering in all respects his description of Barbara, had entered a branch of a foreign institution, lately domiciled in England owing to the persecutions in Germany, but hinting a doubt that there must be a mistake, for this Order admitted as postulants only the children of noble or, at least, aristocratic families. The Canon was indignant, and wrote back a dignified letter to his correspondent, asking, somewhat sarcastically, whether he was aware that her father was a Dublin baronet, and her uncle Canon of X—. The next post brought an apologetic reply; and it assured the Canon that all doubts were cleared up; and that it must have been his niece who had entered the novitiate of the *Dames de Saint Esprit.* She had been sent to Austria to complete her two years' novitiate.

"I thought so," said the Canon grandly. "And I shall be very much surprised if she does not reach the highest—ha—distinction in her Order!"

And fancy—an old man's loving fancy, swept him even farther; and he would dilate at length on the present and future prospects of his niece. And when the poor old people, who had been recipients of Barbara's charity, when she visited her uncle, asked him, with the tender and tenacious gratitude of the

poor: "Wisha, yer reverence, may I make bould to ask you where Miss Wilson is, God bless her?" the Canon would answer: "Yes, my poor woman, I am happy to inform you that my niece, your benefactress, has—ha—entered religion—become a nun, you know, in a community exclusively reserved for the highest continental families." And when the poor would express their joy and surprise: "Wisha, we knew that God would always have a hand in her, the sweet young lady—" the Canon would say: "Yes, indeed. Some day Miss Wilson will reach the highest dignities in her Order, and probably become its mitred Abbess."

And "mitred abbess" became the standing puzzle and enigma to the parish for many months. When the word "mitred" came to be understood, it caused grave head-shaking and heart-trouble.

"The notion of a bishop's hat on a little girl like that," was almost a scandal. Father Cussen was consulted.

"Psha!" he said. "Mitred, indeed! 'Tis the mitre he wants himself. And it should be a pretty high one, for his head is always in the clouds!"

Nevertheless, the Canon was gratified; and the people conceived a larger idea of his power and might, and the greatness of the family.

And even Dr. Wilson was reconciled to the idea, when he discovered that his beloved child was enrolled amongst the nobility of France and Austria.

"After all," he said, "the Church is a beneficent mother, and happily provides shelter for her children in every grade of life."

XXIX.—A Parliamentary Dinner.

It was part of the programme that Luke should invite his brother priests to dine. He was one of the few curates who enjoyed the privilege of "separate maintenance;" and the privilege entailed some responsibilities, and, amongst them, the initial one of giving a "house-warming." He had some nervous qualms and difficulties about it. His prim, cold, English manner had not made him a favorite with the brethren, whose quick, breezy, volatile manners he disliked, and whose attempts at easy familiarity he rather resented. But, he felt he should come down from the stilts, if he were to get on at all in this strange country, where everyone seemed to live in a kind of indolent and easy undress.

"I hope, my dear young friend," said the gentle and kind old pastor, in that tone of urbane and deferential friendship which characterized him, "that you will not go to any extremes in this little entertainment. Your revenue here will be extremely limited; and, in any case, it is always well not to be singular."

"O, no, sir!" said Luke. "I shall attempt nothing beyond what is usual on these occasions. To be very candid, indeed, I should just as soon not be obliged to hold these entertainments. I don't care much for them; and I have a lively horror of a dining-room and all its appliances."

"You know you must command everything you require here," said the old man. "If you would kindly send up your servant, my housekeeper will be most happy to send you any glass, or table-linen, or cutlery you require."

"I am sure I'm most grateful, sir," said Luke. "We shall say five o'clock on Thursday."

The dinner passed off well. Even the stiff formality of the host could not subdue the vitality of his younger guests, which effervesced and bubbled over in jest, and anecdote, and swift, subtle repartee. Nowhere on earth is there such wit and merriment as at a clerical dinner in Ireland. May it be always so, in this land of faith and frolic!

John was waiter; and John was gorgeous in white front and swallow-tailed coat. This idea of a waiter was rather an innovation, which some were disposed to resent; and it palled a little on their spirits, until there was a stumble, and a crash of broken glass in the hall, and the spell was broken. Luke flushed angrily. John was imperturbable. He explained afterwards:

"Where's the use in talkin'? Sure, things *must* be broke."

It was the calm philosophy of Celtic fatalism.

Now, Luke, as he had once explained before, had made the most determined, cast-iron resolution never, under any circumstances, to be inveigled into a discussion on any subject, because, as he explained, it is impossible to conduct a debate on strictly parliamentary lines in Ireland. This, of course, was very chilling and unfriendly; but he thought it wiser and safer. Alas! for human resolutions! What can a man do, in Charybdis, but fling out his arms for succor?

"That reminds me," said a young curate, who had been class-

mate with Luke in Maynooth, "of a legend of our college days, of a student, who was strictly forbidden to enter the rooms of a professor, his uncle. He tried several stratagems, but in vain; for Jack was as 'cute as a fox. Then, he struck on the plan of dragging up the coal-scuttle, and tumbling over it, just at Jack's door. And Jack should come out to see and help the poor servant in his emergency. And then—the warm fire, and the glass of wine."

"I don't see the application of your anecdote?" said Luke, who was very much put about by the accident in the hall.

"Let me see," said the other. "I don't think I intended any application. But let me see! O, yes! I really would not have noticed that clever Ganymede were it not for that crash in the hall. Accidents are required to develop genius."

"It is really wonderful," said the old pastor, "to behold how easily our people fit into their surroundings. You can turn an Irishman into anything. A skilful alchemist, that is, an able statesman, could take up all the waste material in Ireland, and turn it into all beautiful forms of utility and loveliness. I knew that poor fellow," said the old man, in his kind way, "when he nearly broke the heart of the archdeacon by his insobriety and untruthfulness. I never thought that you could transform him so rapidly."

The little compliment made Luke proud, and broke his cast-iron resolution into smithereens. He called for more hot water and coffee, and settled down to a pleasant, academical discussion.

"Yes," he said, folding his napkin over his knees, "the Irish are a plastic race; but the mould in which they are newly cast should never be allowed to run cold. If it is so suffered, they are stereotyped for ever. It is a land of cast-iron conservatism. You cannot break away in originality without becoming a monster. It is the land of the Pyramids and the Sphinxes, with all the newer races staring at it, and giving it up as a puzzle."

"It would no longer be a puzzle," said the young priest abovementioned, "if we were allowed to solve it in our own way. But, it has ever been our misfortune that a blind man is always called upon to solve the riddle."

"I'm not quite so sure of that," said Luke, tossing his soutane over his knees, with the old *sic-argumentaris* gesture; "our ecclesiastical department is not so much meddled with; and behold where we are!"

"And where are we?" said the other.

"I should say somewhere in mediæval times," said Luke. "Compare our ideas of man's fitness, or unfitness for a certain position, with those which obtain the wide world over. In every other department of life you ask, Is this man fit? In our department, you ask, How long is he on the mission? So, too, you never judge a man's actuality by the net amount of work he has done, or is capable of doing, but by, What did he get? The meaning of which enigma is, what prizes did he take in the days of his small clothes and his seminary?"

"You shouldn't complain, Father Delmege," said an old priest; "Maynooth has left its hall-mark upon you, and you cannot rub it off."

"Thank you, Father," said Luke; "but it is just as absurd to speak of a man as a great theologian, because he gained a prize in theology thirty or forty years ago, as to speak of a man as a great warrior, because he was captain in a successful snowball sortie at Eton; or as a great artist in black and white, because he drew a caricature of his teacher on the blackboard of a country-school."

"I often heard that Eton was Waterloo?" said the other.

"One of the world's, or history's falsehoods," said Luke. "It was the starved commissariat of the French, and the treachery of Grouchy, that lost Waterloo, and the well-filled kettles of the British, and the help of Blücher, that won it. It was the victory of stupidity and roast beef over genius and starvation."

"Now, nonsense, Delmege; everyone admits that in the career of every great man his early triumphs are recorded as indications of his future."

"I have not noticed it," said Luke, "because all the great men of *my* acquaintance never cast their heroic shadows in the halls of a university; but this is Ireland all out. You attempt to nail the shadows on the grass, and then believe them realities."

Luke had scored. It was a Pyrrhic victory, and a dangerous one, for it flushed him. His cast-iron resolution was now flung to the winds.

"But to return," he said. "We are just passing through another transition stage, where the new moulding of our people's character

is about to take place. Let us be careful that the new ideals are right, before the genius of the race is fixed for ever."

"There are so many artists at the work now," said the young priest, "that they can hardly blunder."

"I'm not so sure of that," said Luke. "In a 'multitude of counsellors there is much wisdom,' but that supposes that the counsellors can agree upon something. I see nothing before us but to accept the spirit of the century, and conform to the Anglo-Saxon ideal."

This was known to be Luke's pet hobby; but he had never formulated it before. The whole table flared up in an angry flame of protest.

"The Anglo-Saxon ideal? A civilization where Mammon is god, and every man sits with one eye on his ledger—the other on his liver!"

"The Anglo-Saxon ideal? A nation of dead souls, and crumbling bodies!"

"The Anglo-Saxon ideal?" The young priest before-mentioned was on his feet, gesticulating furiously, his hoarse, rasping voice drowning the angry protests of the brethren. Luke grew quite pale under the commotion he had excited.

"Yes," he said, "you have to face civilization for good or ill, or create a civilization of your own. The people are losing the poetry of the past—their belief in Celtic superstitions and creations. Can you create a new poetry for them? and can you fight, and beat back your invaders, except with their own weapons?"

"Better the whole race were swept into the Atlantic," said the young priest, "than that they should compromise all their traditions and their honor by accepting the devil's code of morals. One race after another has been annihilated in this Isle of Destiny for four thousand years. But they passed away with honor untarnished. So shall we!"

"O, my dear Father!" said Luke, deprecatingly, "if you are prepared to sit down and accept the inevitable, all right! There is no need for further argument. Let us fold our togas around us as we fall. But if the struggle is still to continue, there is not much use in kite-flying, in the hope that we are going to call down the lightnings of heaven on our opponents."

"I suppose 'tis Destiny," said the young fire-eater, resuming

his seat. "But, better be exterminated a hundred times than turned into money-grubbers and beef-eaters."

"It's only the cyclical movement in all history, noticed by all great thinkers, and formulated by Vico and Campanella," said Luke, now victorious and exultant, and *forgetful*, "the *corsi* and *ricorsi* of all human progress; and there is one great luminous truth running through it all—that he who cannot govern himself must allow himself to be governed by another; and that the world will always be governed by those who are superior in nature."

It is a little thing that turns the Irish mind from anger or despair to laughter.

"Would you please pass down the *corsi* and *ricorsi* of that coffee and hot water?" said a young wit; and lo! the discussion ended in a roar of merriment.

Just then a sweet, clear, girlish voice, just outside the window, which was raised this warm, summer evening, sang softly, and with great feeling, the first lines of Lady Dufferin's pathetic ballad:

I'm sitting on the stile, Mary, where we sat, side by side.

It was so sweet and mournful, there in that Irish village, with the golden sun streaming over the landscape, and the air warmed and perfumed with the sweet odor of the honeysuckle that clambered around the window; and it seemed so appropriate, that the priests were hushed into silence. It wrapped in music the whole discussion, which had just terminated. It was the *caoine* of the Banshee over the fated race.

I'm biddin' you a long farewell, my Mary, kind and true!
But I'll not forget you, darlin', in the land I'm goin' to;
They say there's bread and work for all, and the sun shines always there,
But I'll not forget old Ireland, were it fifty times as fair.

Not a word was spoken at the dinner table till the singer concluded. It was the infinite pathos of Ireland!

The girl came to the open window, and pleaded. She was a tall, slim young girl, dark as an Italian, the hood of her light, black shawl scarcely concealing the black curls that hung down on her forehead. The plate went round; and she held more silver that evening in her hands than she had ever seen in her life before.

"If Father Meade were here," said Dr. Keatinge with a smile,

"he would say it was the ghost of Erin—the wraith of a departed people."

"I'll not forget you, darlin'," soliloquized the young priest; "but they do forget you, darlin'; and what is more, they despise you. And there isn't on earth, or in the nether hell," he said vehemently, bringing his hand down heavily on the table, "a more contemptible being than he, who, seduced by the glitter and glare of foreign civilizations, has come to despise his motherland."

"Now, now, now, that song has excited you, Cole," said his neighbor.

"I'm not excited," he protested; "but I tell you, 'tisn't English steel, but American gold, we fear."

"Never mind, Cole," said another, "the *corsi* and *recorsi* will swing around again in their cycles, and Ireland will come uppermost!"

"Yes!" he hissed, "if she does not forget her destiny."

"And what might that be, Cole?" shouted one or two, laughing at his vehemence.

"What might that be? *What would have been the destiny of the Jewish race if they had not rejected Christ?*"

"Delmege, compose this fellow's nerves, and sing 'The Muster.'"

But no! Luke had forgotten "The Muster"—he couldn't recall the words—it was many years since he sang it, etc. He sang:

Oh! doth not a meeting like this make amends?

"I wouldn't doubt him," said the fire-eater. "He's the Canon's pupil, and an apt one."

The guests dispersed early; and Luke was alone—and unhappy. What was the reason that he always felt miserable after much contact with men? And especially, when he returned to himself after a temporary dissipation of thought, why was he always angry with himself and dissatisfied? Every touch of the external world made this sensitive nature shrink more closely into itself, except when he had something to look up to and to worship. With all his professions of practical wisdom, he was forever craving after an ideal that was shy and unrevealed.

As he passed from the heated atmosphere of the dining-room

into the cool garden that was behind the house, he heard the soft patter of feet in the kitchen, and a low whistling sound. Both were faint and muffled, as if with an effort at concealment; and then the whistling broke out into articulate language:

(*Forte*) "Welt the flure, Biddy McClure!"

(*Andante*) "Show them the right step, Mary McCarthy!"

(*Fortissimo*) "Yerra, dance to the music, ye divils!"

(*Adagio*) "At—the—widow—McLau—au—au—ghlin's pa—a—a—a—rty!"

Then the dancing ceased.

"I'm too warrum," said Mary, "and I'm tired afther all the cookin' and slushin'."

"An ye did it well, Mary," said John, the musician; "I never saw a betther dinner at the Archdayken's."

"Wisha! for the luv of God, stop the 'Archdayken's,'" said Mary, who despised flattery; "it's nothin' but 'Archdayken' here, and 'Archdayken' there. Why didn't you sthop wid him, whin you were there?"

"Take that, John," said one of the boys, who had dropped in, with that easy familiarity which is common to the country.

"I didn't mane any harrum," said John, humbly. "But it was a grand dinner, out an' out; I heard the priests say so."

"You'll have a nice pinny to pay for all the glass you broke," said Mary. "The masther looked like a jedge wid his black cap."

"'Twasn't that made him mad," said John, "but that little red priesht from Lorrhabeg. Begor, he pitched into the masther like mad."

"He met his match, thin," said Mary. "I'd like to see wan of 'em, excep' the parish priesht, who could hould a candle to him."

"What was it all about?" said one of the neighbors, unable to restrain his curiosity.

"No saycrets out o' school. If you tell this 'purty boy,' he'll have it in all the public houses in the parish before Sunday," said Mary, the loyal.

"Wisha, 'twasn't much," said John. "'Twas all the ould story of England and Ireland. The masther said we must all be English, or be swept into the say. The little wan pitched the English to the divil, and said we're Irish or nothin'."

"And who got the best of it?" said the 'purty boy.'

"Hard to say," said John. "They were all talkin' thegither, and jumpin' up, like Jack-in-the-Box, excep' the quite ould parish priests. And thin that girl came, and you'd think they wor all in their cradles."

"Begor, they're a quare lot," said the purty boy. "They're as like childre as two pays. Get wan of 'em into a tearin' rampage about the dhrink, or a dance, or a bit of coortin'; and thin say a word about the Blessed Vargin, or the ould land, and you have him quite as a lamb in a minit."

"The English and the landlords would have aisy times but for 'em," said Mary.

"Thry that jig agin, Mary," said John. "I'll get the concertina."

"No," said Mary; "'tis too warrum."

"I'm thinkin', John," said the purty boy, "of gettin' me taylor to make a shuit for me, like that. What 'ud it cost?"

"More than iver you see in your life," said John angrily.

"But we could get it secon'-hand, like yoursel'," said the other.

"Stop that," said Mary, peremptorily. She objected to a duel "Remimber where ye are. Get the concertina, John. The masther won't mind."

"Fun, fighting, and praying," thought Luke. "The Lord never intended the Irish to work."

He strolled along the village street, the quiet, calm beauty of the evening stealing into his soul, and stilling the irritation and annoyance of that dinner table. The purple mountains in the distance seemed to contract and expand, as the shadow or the sunlight fell upon them. The air was heavy with the odors of roses and woodbine, and yet cooled with the breezes that floated down from the hills, over whose sharp ridges were pencilled darker lines, as you see in the horizon lines of the sea. The old men sat smoking their clay pipes leisurely. The old women pondered and meditated, with that air of resigned peace so peculiar to the Irish. A crowd of children were laughing and playing in the main street, gambolling in circles, and singing that folksong, that is common to the children of half the globe:

London bridge is broken down,
Grand, said the little dear:
London bridge is broken down:
Faire Ladye!

Build it up with lime and sand!
Grand, said the little dear!
Build it up with lime and sand,
Faire Ladye!

On the bridge were perched twenty or thirty young men, resting after the day's toil; and listening to the soft wailing of a flute, played by one of their number.

Luke passed swiftly through all. The old people arose, and curtseyed, the men taking their pipes from their mouths. Luke said: "How d'ye do?" They did not understand. They were accustomed to something different from their kind, old priests. "How are you, Maurya? How are the pains?" "Cauth, when did you hear from the little girl in Boston?" "The murphies are gettin' dry, Pat." "To be sure, man, send over for the saddle in the morning, and keep it as long as you like." "That's the finest clutch of chickens I saw this year," etc., etc.

"He's a fine man, God bless him," said the women, as they resumed their seats. "But he's mighty proud."

The children ceased from play, as he approached, and ran to their mothers. The boys leaped from the bridge, and saluted. The player hid his flute. They all could tell where the curate lived; but oh! he was a thousand miles away from their hearts. He passed out into the country under the thick twilight of the beeches. The privet hedges threw out their white blossoms, heavy with the odors which the bees loved; the sweet woodbine twined in and out of the hawthorn and briar; and the white clover, stamped by the feet of the voluptuous kine, wafted its sweetness to the passer-by. Far away some girls were singing an old Irish air; and, as Luke stopped to listen, and watched the blue smoke curling upwards in a straight line from the cottages, he heard the flute again wailing out another Irish threnody, *The Coulin*. Then, the voices of the children rose, clear and shrill again:

London bridge is broken down,
Grand, said the little dear:
London bridge is broken down,
Faire Ladye!

The problem of the inexorable present; and the prophecy of the inevitable future strangely blended again.

He went into the little village church again, on returning. There was a deeper twilight here than without. He knelt to make his evening visit, and say his rosary. Here and there were scattered some of the pious villagers. You heard only their whispered prayers, and the rattle of their beads. At the altar rails, bowed in reverential love, was the old pastor, his head slightly inclined to one side. Luke envied him.

"I wish I were old," he said, "and done with these life's enigmas. These old men seem to cast untroubled glances into eternity."

He stopped a moment at his cottage gate, before retiring for the night, and looked down upon the street, the neat cottages, outlined against the dark, deep bank of the thick foliage behind. It was very peaceful.

"A wise man would make up his mind to be happy here," he said. "But will it last? And what can I do to preserve and extend it?" The problem and puzzle again.

"Anything that man can do, I'll do," he said vehemently, "to solve this dread enigma, and save this devoted people."

The following morning two letters lay on his breakfast table. One was from Amiel Lefevril. It was one of many. And it was the old cant.

"Humanity is incarnate in all great men in a supreme degree; the true *Shechinah*, says Chrysostom, is man. Every child of Humanity is a transfigured type of Humanity. We are immortal in the immortality of the Race. Seek the Divine in Man, and help its development."

"There is a hidden element of truth in the jargon," said Luke. "Wonder we were never told it."

And Luke forgot that he had taken "First of First" in Maynooth, in Dogmatic Theology; and that he had held with vigor and success that "the revelation of God in Man, through the lowly figure of Jesus of Nazareth, had a far-reaching object, apart from the immediate purpose of the Incarnation; and that was, to confound the pride of mortals in the perfectibility of the race."

"If we could only teach these poor people," he said, "that their lofty ambition: Seek ye the God in man, was once, and only

once, realized, all would be well. But, then, they should become little children again; and Nicodemus said that was impossible."

The other letter was from Margery, asking for light and advice on a critical question, about which Father Tracey, who said he had no idea of theology or mysticism, was much concerned. It would appear that one of their penitents, Sister Mary of Magdala, who had been a great sinner, was now developing extraordinary sanctity; and Father Tracey craved light on one or two knotty points.

"Dear Luke" [the letter ran], "don't throw this aside in petulance or disgust. I know, and if I didn't, Father Tracey would convince me, that you are a profound theologian. But somehow I feel, too, that these things are revealed to little children. Luke dear, be a little child, as well as a profound thinker; and let me know all you think on this most important matter. You have no idea of the peace of mind it will give us all, especially dear Father Tracey.

"Mother is not too well. Won't you go see her?"

"Well, well," said Luke; "is there any use in talking to nuns, at all?"

He wrote his little sister to say, that the veriest tyro in theology knew that these poor penitent girls were either subject very frequently to delusions, especially in the way of superior sanctity; or, were unfortunately prone to simulation of virtue for the purposes of deception. He had no doubt, whatever, that the case submitted to him came under one of these two heads; and he would advise his sister not to get involved in any way in what would probably prove an imposture, which might also eventuate in a grave scandal. Father Tracey, he understood, was an excellent man; but rather prone to take unwise views about spiritual manifestations, on which the Church always looked with doubt and suspicion.

Clearly, Luke had become very practical. A good many years had gone by, since he vowed his pilgrimage to the city to kiss this old man's feet.

He took up his sister's letter again; and read it in a puzzled manner.

"It is downright positivism," he declared. "Margery, too, sees the Divine in Man—this time, in a wretched penitent. Imagine—Amiel Lefevril and Sister Eulalie arriving at the same conclusion from opposite poles of thought."

Analecta.

APOSTOLIC DELEGATION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 12, 1901.

To the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Rev. Dear Sir:—I have just received from His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, a letter under date of March 28th, No. 43509, in which he says that a certain object of devotion which has recently been placed on sale in the United States, and is called the "Cross of the Immaculate Conception," and consists of a cross with a figure of the Blessed Virgin stamped on it, has been submitted to the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office for its judgment. The said Sacred Congregation, on the 13th of March, 1901, has issued the following decree: "*Crucem de qua sermo, uti est, non esse probandam.*" The Most Eminent Prefect of Propaganda requests that this decision be made public in the United States.

Most faithfully in Xt.,

† SEBASTIAN, ABP. OF EPHESUS,

Apostolic Delegate.

E S. R. UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

DE RECURSU AD ORDINARIUM IN CASIBUS S. SEDI RESERVATIS.

Beatissime Pater:

In casibus urgentioribus . . . (Decret. S. Officii 20 iunii 1886), dari potest absolutio a reservatis S. Sedi, sub poena tamen reincidentiae nisi absolutus infra mensem ad Sanctam Sedem recurrat, eius mandata suscepturus.

Ubi tamen Episcopi facultatem habent delegatam absolvendi a praedictis reservatis, qualis solet ipsis concedi per quinquennale folium S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide (F. X) sub. n. 10, dubitatur de necessitate recursus immediati ad S. Sedem.

Quaerit igitur Episcopus N. N., ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae humiliter provolutus:

I. Utrum sufficiat in casu absolutionis, ut supra, concessae recursus ad Episcopum facultate absolvendi instructum? et quatenus affirmative:

II. Utrum sufficiat etiam in casu eodem recursus ad Vicarium generalem Episcopi, tanquam ad Ordinarium facultatum episcopalium absolvendi, de iure participem?

III. Utrum generatim sufficiat recursus ad quemlibet Sacerdotem habitualiter subdelegatum ab Ordinario ad absolvendum ab his papalibus reservatis, a quibus poenitens fuerit accidentaliter ut supra, vi decreti S. Officii 1886, absolutus?

Et Deus etc.

Feria IV, die 19 Decembris 1900.

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis ab EE.mis ac RR.mis DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, propositis suprascriptis dubiis, praehabitoque RR. Consultorum voto, iidem EE.mi ac RR.mi Patres respondendum mandarunt:

Ad I et II. Affirmative, facto verbo cum Sanctissimo.

Ad III. Negative.

Feria VI vero, die 21 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia SS.mi D. N. Leonis Div. Prov. Pp. XIII a R. P. D. Adsessore S. Officii habita, SS.mus D. N. resolutionem EE.morum ac RR.morum Patrum ratam habuit et confirmavit.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inquisit. Notarius.*

II.

PERMITTI NON POTEST UT HAERETICUS ADMITTATUR UT PATRINUS.

Beatissimo Padre:

L'Arcivescovo N. N., prostrato ai piedi della S. V., umilmente chiede se possa permettere ad un protestante che faccia da patrino nel battesimo cattolico di una figlia di coniugi di mista religione, sposati solo innanzi al ministro eretico.

Che ecc.

Feria IV, die 27 Iunii 1900.

In Congregatione Generali ab E.mis ac R.mis. DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, proposito suprascripto dubio, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE. ac RR. Patres respondendum mandarunt:

Permitti non posse.

Sequenti vero feria V, loco VI. die 28 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia SS. D. N. Leonis Div. Prov. Pp. XIII a R. P. D. Adsessore S. Officii habita, SS.mus D. N. resolutionem EE. ac RR. Patrum approbavit.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inquisit. Notarius.*

III.

POSSUNT SUBDELEGARI RECTORES PRO JURAMENTO SUPPLETORIO IN ORDINE AD MATRIMONIUM VAGORUM.

Beatissimo Padre:

Il Vescovo N. N., prostrato ai piedi della S. V., umilmente espone che gravi ragioni, non esclusa quella della lontananza dei luoghi, spesso non permettono che a ricevere il guiramento suppletorio pei matrimonii dei vaghi siano suddelegati i Vicarii Foranei, tornando assai più opportuno che tale suddelegazione sia data al Parroco o al Vice-parroco del luogo. Supplica perciò che gli sia concessa tale facoltà, non ostante che i Parroci o i Vice-parroci non possano forse riputarsi *personae insignes et idoneae*, a tenore della Istruzione del S. Officio del 21 Agosto 1676, e come furono ritenuti i Vicarii foranei con risposta del S. Officio del 24 febbraio 1847 al dubbio VII.—E poichè il Vescovo supplicante si

accinge a celebrare il Sinodo Diocesano, ossequiosamente chiede se il detto Sinodo possa delegare abitualmente i Parroci e i Reggenti le parrocchie vacanti a ricevere siffatti giuramenti suppletori.

Che ecc.

Feria IV, die 8 Augusti 1900.

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis coram EE. et RR. DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, propositis praedictis precibus praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto EE. ac RR. DD. Cardinales respondendum mandarunt:

Ad mentem. Mens est quod non expedit in Synodo Dioecesana insertio, de qua in precibus. Ceterum Episcopus utatur facultate biennali, quam habet ab hac Suprema Congregatione, vi cuius quemcumque parochum subdelegare potest ad iuramentum suppletorium recipiendum.

Sequenti vero Feria VI, die 10 eiusdem mensis et anni, in audientia SS. D. N. Leonis Div. Prov. Pp. XIII a R. P. D. Adsessore S. Officii habita, SS. D. N. resolutionem EE. ac RR. Patrum adprobavit.

I. *Can.* Mancini *S. R. et U. Inquisit. Notarius.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

Dubia circa indulgentias altaris privilegiati, et in articulo mortis.

Vicarius Capitularis Archidioec. Leopolien. Ruthenor. a S. Indulgentiarum Cong.ne humiliter expostulat solutionem sequentium dubiorum:

I. Utrum Indulgentia altaris privilegiati possit lucrifieri pro anima unius defuncti, si respectiva Missa offertur non tantum pro defunctis, sed simul etiam pro vivis?

II. Cum ex una parte expresse statuatur quod Indulgentia in articulo mortis pro defunctis applicari non possit, ex altera vero parte illi qui fecerunt actum heroicum pro defunctis, omnes Indulgentias, etsi alias pro defunctis non applicabiles, tamen pro ipsis offerre possint, ideo quaeritur:

(*a*) An illi qui laudatum actum heroicum fecerunt, possint, immo, si istum actum revocare nolunt, etiam debeant Indulgentiam lucrifactam in articulo mortis pro defunctis offere?

Atque, si affirmative:

(*b*) An posito isto actu heroico Indulgentia plenaria in articulo mortis, etsi variis titulis et repetitis respectivis operibus lucrifacta, tamen una tantum et non pluribus vicibus pro defunctis lucretur?

Porro S. Cong. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, audito etiam unius Consultoris voto, respondendum mandavit:

Ad I. Negative, et detur decretum in una *Squillacen.* d. d. 25 Augusti 1897, ad dub. 2.um.

Ad II. Ad 1.am partem: Non esse interloquendum; Ad 2.am partem, reformato dubio uti sequitur: An ii qui laudatum actum heroicum emiserunt, et ex variis titulis lucrari possunt plures Plenarias Indulgentias in mortis articulo, valeant saltem unam tantum Indulgentiam Plenariam pro defunctis lucrari, alias vero sibi reservare; resp. Ut in praecedenti responsione ad 1.am partem, et ad mentem: mens autem est Plenariam Indulgentiam pro mortis articulo concessam una vice tantum lucrari, id est in vero mortis articulo, etsi moribundus ad eam ius habeat ex variis titulis.

Datum Romae ex Secr. eiusdem S. C. die 23 Ianuarii 1901.

SERAPHINUS *Card.* CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. † S.

† FRANCISCUS *Archiep.* AMIDEN., *Secrius.*

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—APOSTOLIC DELEGATION communicates decision of Holy Office, that so-called "Cross of the Immaculate Conception" is not approved.

II.—UNIVERSAL INQUISITION:

1. Permits that in urgent cases, when absolution reserved to the Holy See has been given, recourse may be had to the Ordinary or to the Vicar General having due faculties, in place of the Apostolic Penitentiary
2. Protestant may not act as sponsor in a Catholic baptism. The case is that of a child born of mixed marriage contracted before a Protestant minister.
3. Allows that the Ordinary, having obtained the requisite faculties, may subdelegate the rectors of churches to receive the *juramentum suppletorium* required from strangers who desire to marry within his jurisdiction. This faculty is ordinarily given to vicars forane.

III.—S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES decides: (*a*) that the indulgence of privileged altars cannot be gained if the Mass be offered *simul etiam pro vivis;* (*b*) that the indulgence *pro articulo mortis* can be gained but once, even though it be offered *pro defunctis* by those who have made the heroic act, by which all their good works are applied to the suffering souls.

A DEVOTIONAL ABUSE.

The letter of His Eminence, theApostolic Delegate, communicating to the editor of the REVIEW[1] the decision of the Holy Office

[1] See *Analecta*, p. 498.

regarding the so-called "Cross of the Immaculate Conception," is instructive in several ways.

The symbols of Catholic devotion are not merely pious incentives to prayer or to acts of self-denial and charity; they are also expressions of the mind of the Church and of the truth she teaches. To the thoughtful Catholic every object of devotion carries with it an appeal to the intelligence in its setting forth of the doctrine of the Church. A true Catholic instinct generally recognizes any false combination of religious symbolism which fosters superstition or erroneous conceptions of doctrine, and thus lends itself to the propagation of falsehood and misrepresentation of Catholic belief.

The "Cross of the Immaculate Conception" is a case in point Under the plea that the Virgin Mother of Christ had a share in the Passion of her Divine Son, and that her immunity from the stain of original sin is the anticipated fruit of the Cross of Christ, it combines the image of the Blessed Virgin with that of the Cross, and puts the figure of the Immaculate Mother where the body of the dying Saviour is properly placed to show that He died for mankind. Him we adore when we bend the knee to the symbol of the Cross; and it is utterly misleading to place upon the Cross our Blessed Lady, who, however exalted she is among the children of men, differs from her Divine Son by the illimitable distance that exists between the Creator and the creature, between God and man. So the pretty cross is apt to teach false doctrine and should not be used by Catholics; for a symbol that serves to deform truth is itself at best but a beautiful pretence.

A PATTERN FOR MAKING THE "ORDO" OF 1902.

There are a number of difficulties owing to the introduction of the revised rubrics and new feasts, which will present themselves in arranging the ecclesiastical directory for the coming year. The following calendar, prepared for the Roman *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, gives the arrangement of offices for the Mass and the canonical hours of the Breviary during 1902. Those who prepare the ordos for the various dioceses need only take account of the particular local offices to make the requisite changes in each case.

Easter, which is the central point of the ecclesiastical cycle, occurs on March 30. The other movable feasts arrange themselves accordingly, as follows: Septuagesima Sunday, January 26; Ash-Wednesday, February 12; Rogation Days, May 5, 6, 7; Ascension Thursday, May 8; Pentecost Sunday, May 18; Corpus Christi, May 29; First Sunday of Advent, November 30; the Quartertenses occur on February 19, 21, 22; May 21, 23, 24; September 17, 19, 20; December 17, 19, 20. The seasons during which solemn marriages are forbidden are from February 12 to April 6, and from November 30 to January 6.

Martyrology calls for the following indications: *Litera Dominicalis*, e; *Aureus Numerus*, 3; *Epacta*, XXI; *Litera Martyrologii*, B; *Cyclus Solaris*, 7; *Dominicae post Epiphaniam*, 2; *Dom. post Pentecosten*, 27.

JANUARY.

† 1 F. 4. CIRCUMCISIONIS DNI *d. 2. cl.*
2 F. 5. Oct. Stephani *d.* c. octavar.
3 F. 6. Oct. Ioannis *d.* c. oct.
4 S. Oct. Innoc. *d.*
† 5 D. (*vacat*) Vigil. Epiph. *sem.* c. Telesphori.
† 6 F. 2. EPIPHANIAE DNI *d. 1. cl. cum oct. privil.*

CRAS MANE APERIUNTUR NUPTIAE.

7 F. 3. De 2. die infra oct. *sem.*
8 F. 4. De 3. die infra oct. *sem.*
9 F. 5. De 4. die infra oct. *sem.*
10 F. 6. De 5. die infra oct. *sem.* c. Hygini.
11 S. De 6. die infra oct. *sem.*
† 12 D. infra oct. 1. p. Epiph. *sem.* c. oct.—*Inc. Ep. I. ad Corinthios.*
13 F. 2. Oct. Epiph. *d.*
14 F. 3. Hilarii *d.* c. Felicis.
15 F. 4. Pauli I. Erem. *d.* c. Mauri.
16 F. 5. Marcelli I. *sem.*—*Resumuntur Suffragia.*
17 F. 6. Antonii *d.*
18 S. Cathedrae Rom. *d. m.* c. Pauli Ap. ac Priscae.
† 19 D. 2. p. Epiph. NOMINIS IESU, *d. 2. cl.* c. Dom. (ac Marii et Soc. in Laud. et Miss. priv.) Nihil de Canuto.
20 F. 2. Fabiani et Sebastiani d.—*Inc. Ep. II. ad Corinthios*, ex Dom. praec.
21 F. 3. Agnetis *d.*
22 F. 4. Vincentii et Anastasii *sem.* (Romae *d.*)
23 F. 5. Raymundi a Pennaf. *sem.* c. Emerentianae.—*In Stat. Eccl. et Veneto.* Desponsat. B. M. V. *d. m.* c. Ioseph ac Emerentianae.
24 F. 6. Timothei *d.*
25 S. Convers. Pauli *d. m.* 9. l. hom. Dom. 3. p. Epiph. c. Petri Ap. (ac Dom. in Laud. et Miss. tant.).
† 26 D. SEPTUAGESIMAE *2. cl.* c. Polycarpi.
27 F. 2. Io. Chrysostomi *d.*
28 F. 3. Agnetis *simp.* — *vel* Vot. App. c. Agnetis—(1) *aliq. loc.* (*a*) Orationis Dni *d. m.* c. Agnetis—(*b*) S. Familiae (*f. 26 hui.*) *d. m.* c. Agnetis.

(1) Maioris perspicuitatis gratia diebus 28 huius mensis, 13, 14, 15, et 17 Februarii literae alphabeticae praemittuntur variis officiis; earumdem autem significatio heic subiicitur:

(*a*) Ubi praeter Officia Passionis Domini concessum est Officium S. Familiae.

(*b*) Ubi est concessum Officium S. Familiae tantum.

29 F. 4. Francisci Salesii *d.*
30 F. 5. Martinae *sem.* (Romae *d.*).
31 F. 6. Petri Nolasco *d.*

FEBRUARY.

1 S. Ignatii *d.*
† 2 D. SEXAGESIMAE *2. cl. sem.*
3 F. 2. PURIFICATIONIS B. M.V.(*f. heri*) *d. 2. cl.* c. Blasii (in Laud. et Miss. priv.).
4 F. 3. Andreae Corsini *d.*—*aliq. loc.* Comm. Passionis *d. m.* c. Andreae Corsini.
5 F. 4. Agathae *d.*
6 F. 5. Titi *d.* (*In Stat. Eccl.* Hyacinthae Mariscott. *d.*) c. Dorotheae.
7 F. 6. Romualdi *d.*
8 S. Ioannis de Matha *d.*
† 9 D. QUINQUAGESIMAE *2 cl. sem.* c. (*in Stat. Eccl.* Titi *ass. ex 6 hui.* et) Apolloniae.
10 F. 2. Scholasticae *d.*
11 F. 3. Sept. Fundatorum *d.*—*aliq. loc.* S. Columnae Flagellat. D. N. I. C. *d. m.* c. Sept. Fund.

CRAS CLAUDUNTUR NUPTIAE.

12 F. 4. CINERUM *simp.*(*Extra Stat. Eccl. in loc. in quib. concess. est Off. Desponsat.* c. Raymundi a Pennaf. *ass. ex 23 Ian.*)
13 F. 5. Cyrilli Alexandrini (*f. 9 vel 12 hui.*) *d.* — *In Stat. Eccl.* Raymundi a Pennaf. (*ass. ex 23 Ian.*) *sem.*—*aliq. loc. extra Stat. Eccl.* (*a*) S. Familiae (*f. 26 Ian.*) *d. m.* —Per tot. Quadrag. in Off. de Ss. dicitur 9. l. de hom. et fit com. feriae.
14 F. 6. De ea, c. Valentini — *vel* Vot. Passion. c. Valentini.—*aliq. loc.* Spineae Coronae *d. m.* c. Valentini — *aliq. loc. in Stat. Eccl.* (*b*) Cyrilli Alexandrini (*f. 12 ass. ex 9 hui*) *d.* c. Valentini.
15 S. De eo, c. Faustini et Iovitae. —*vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.c. Faustini et Iovitae.—*aliq. loc. in Stat. Eccl.* (*a*) S. Familiae (*f. 26 Ian.*) *d. m.* c. Faustini et Iovitae.—*aliq. loc. extra Stat. Eccl.* (*a*) Cyrilli Alexandrini (*f. 9 hui.*) *d.* c. Faustini et Iovitae.

Incipit pars verna Breviarii.

† 16 D. 1. QUADRAG. *1. cl. sem.*
17 F. 2. De ea — *vel* Vot. Angel. — *aliq. loc. in Stat. Eccl.* (*a*) Cyrilli Alexandrini (*f. 12 ass. ex 9 hui.*) *d.*
18 F. 3. De ea, c. Simeonis — *vel* Vot. App. (*Romae.* Vot. Petri et Pauli) c. Simeonis.
19 F. 4. QUAT. TEMP. De ea — *vel* Vot. Ioseph.
20 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.
21 F. 6. QUAT. TEMP. De ea — *vel* Vot. Passionis—*aliq. loc.* Lanceae et Clavorum *d. m.*
22 S. QUAT. TEMP. Vigil. (de qua nihil in Off.) Cathedrae Antioch. *d. m.* c. Pauli Ap. (In Miss. 4. or. Vigil.).
† 23 D. 2. QUADRAG. *2 cl. sem.*
† 24 F. 2. MATHIAE *d. 2. cl.*
25 F. 3. Petri Damiani (*f. 23 hui.*) *d.*—*In Italia.* Margaritae de Cortona *sem.*
26 F. 4. De ea—*vel* Vot. Ioseph.—*In Italia.* Petri Damiani (*f. 23 hui.*) *d.*
27 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.
28 F. 6. De ea—*vel* Vot. Passionis—*aliq. loc.* Sindonis Dni *d. m.*

MARCH.

1 S. De ea — *vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.
† 2 D. 3. QUADRAG. *2. cl. sem.*
3 F. 2. De ea—*vel* Vot. Angel.
4 F. 3. Casimiri *sem.* c. Lucii I.
5 F. 4. De ea—*vel* Vot. Ioseph.
6 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.
7 F. 6. Thomae Aquin. *d.* c. Perpe-

tuae et Felicitatis—*aliq. loc.* Quinque Vulnerum Dni *d. m.* c. Perpetuae et Felicitatis.
8 S. Ioannnis de Deo *d.*
† 9 D. 4. QUADRAG. *2. cl. sem.* c. Franciscae Rom.
10 F. 2. Quadraginta Mm. *sem.*
11 F. 3. De ea — *vel* Vot. App. — *aliq. loc.* Thomae Aquin. (*f. 7 hui.*) *d.*
12 F. 4. Gregorii Magni I. *d.*
13 F. 5. De ea—*vel* Vot. Sacram.
14 F. 6. De ea—*vel* Vot. Passionis. —*aliq. loc.* Pretios. Sanguinis Dni *d. m.*
15 S. De eo—*vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.
†16 D. PASSIONIS *1. cl. sem.* "Cessant Suffragia et Off. vot."
17 F. 2. Patritii *d.*
18 F. 3. Cyrilli Hierosol. *d.*— *aliq. loc.* Gabrielis Archang. *d. m.*
†19 F. 4. IOSEPH *d. 1. cl.*
20 F. 5. De ea — *aliq. loc.* Cyrilli Hierosol. (*ass. ex 18 hui.*) *d.*
21 F. 6. Benedicti *d. m.*
22 S. VII Dolorum B. M.V (*f. heri*) *d. m.* (*In Italia* c. Catharinae Fliscae Adurnae).
†23 D. PALMARUM *1. cl. sem.*
24 F. 2. mai. hebd. De ea.
†25 F. 3. mai. hebd. De ea.
26 F. 4. mai. hebd. De ea.
27 F. 5. in COENA DOMINI *d. 1. cl.*
28 F. 6. in PARASCEVE *d. 1. cl.* (nihil de Ioanne a Capistr.).
29 SAB. SANCTUM *d. 1. cl.*
†30 D. PASCHA RESURRECTIONIS *d. 1. cl. cum oct.*
† 31 F. 2. DE EA *d. 1. cl.*

APRIL.

† 1 F. 3. DE EA *d. 1. cl.*
2 F. 4. De ea *sem.* c. Francisci.
3 F. 5. De ea *sem.*
4 F. 6. De ea *sem.*
5 S. De ea *sem.* c. Vincentii.
† 6 D. IN ALBIS *1. cl.* De ea *d.*

CRAS MANE APERIUNTUR NUPTIAE.

7 F. 2. ANNUNTIATIONIS B. M. V. (*f. 25 Mart. d. 1. cl.*).
8 F. 3. Io. Damasceni (*f. 27 Mart.*) *d.*
9 F. 4. Isidori (*f. 4 hui.*) *d.*
10 F. 5. De ea "Suffr. de Cruce"—*vel* Vot. Sacram. (*sine Suffr. de Cruce—Inc. lib. Act. Ap.* ex fer. 2. praec.
11 F. 6. Leonis I. *d.*
12 S. De B. M. in Sabb. *simp.—vel* Vot. Imm. Concept.
†13 D. 2. p. Pascha. De ea *sem.* c. Hermenegildi.
14 F. 2. Iustini *d.* c. Tiburtii et Soc.
15 F. 3. De ea—*vel* Vot. App. (*Romae* Vot. Petri et Pauli).
16 F. 4. De ea—*vel* Vot. Ioseph.
17 F. 5. Aniceti *simp.—vel* Vot. Sacram. c. Aniceti (*sine Suffr. de Cruce*).
18 F. 6. De ea—*vel* Vot. Passionis (*sine Suffr. de Cruce*).
19 S. De B. M. in Sabb. *simp.—ve* Vot. Imm. Concept.
†20 D. 3. p. Pascha. PATROCINII IOSEPH *d. 2. cl.* c. Dom.
21 F. 2. Anselmi *d.*
22 F. 3. Soteris et Caii *sem.—Inc. lib. Apocal.* ex Dom. praec.
23 F. 4. Georgii *sem.*
24 F. 5. Fidelis a Sigmaringa *d.*
25 F. 6. MARCI *d. 2. cl.*
26 S. Cleti et Marcellini *sem.—aliq. loc.* B. M. V. de Bono Consilio *d. m.*
†27 D. 4. p. Pascha.—De ea *sem.* (*aliq loc.* c. Cleti et Marcellini *ass. ex 26 hui.*).—*Inc. Ep. Iacobi.*
28 F. 2. Pauli a Cruce *d.* c. Vitalis.
29 F. 3. Petri *d.*
30 F. 4. Catharinae Sen. *d.* (Romae *d. 2. cl.*).

(To be continued.

UNABLE TO ENTER THE CHURCH FOR THE JUBILEE.

The following question having been submitted to the Rev. Father Putzer, he sends us the reply as below:

Qu. Father Putzer, in his *Manual of the Jubilee* (p. 18) and in an article on the same subject in the last number of the REVIEW (p. 425), maintains that a visit to the church, in order to fulfil the precept of hearing Mass on Sunday, does also satisfy the obligation of a visit to gain the Jubilee Indulgence. The only argument upon which he rests this opinion—besides the negative plea that the contrary cannot be shown from any existing law—is this: that actual presence in the church is not essential for the fulfilment of the duty of hearing Mass; wherefore, "If one goes into the church with the double intention of fulfilling the duty of hearing Mass and of gaining the Jubilee, the visit, not being obligatory for the precept of hearing Mass, serves as a Jubilee visit."

This would seem to imply that to gain the Jubilee Indulgence one must go *into* the church. But Father Putzer himself shows that this is not always necessary; for if the church should happen to be overcrowded or accidentally closed one would gain the Indulgence by praying at the door.

It follows, then, that the distinction which he uses as an argument is in reality without a difference, and applies to the Jubilee as well as to the Mass. In neither case is it of the "essence of the precept to enter the church or to pray there." I am anxious to know what Father Putzer has to say on this subject, for the correctness of his view or otherwise considerably modifies the conditions under which many persons might be induced to make the Jubilee.

Resp. It is true that to gain the Jubilee Indulgence, unless the visits are commuted, one must go *into* the church designated to say there the Jubilee prayers, if one can enter it. If the church is overcrowded or its doors are closed, it suffices, according to the doctrine of St. Alphonsus and other theologians, to unite in prayer with those outside or at the door of the church.

My reverend inquirer speaks of a precept of entering the church for the purpose of making the Jubilee. There is no such precept, as there is no precept at all obliging any one to make the Jubilee. It is, however, an essential condition for those who wish to gain the Indulgence. It is, moreover, erroneous to say that

during the Jubilee visits it is not necessary "to pray there," viz., in the church. True, it is not expressly prescribed in the Jubilee Extension Bull to say the prayers in the churches designated; but, as Arizzoli points out,[1] it is customary to do so (*in usu*) and former extension Bulls of Benedict XIV, Pius VI, and Leo XII expressly prescribed it.

Moreover, there is a decided difference between visiting the church for the purpose of hearing Mass on days of obligation and visiting the churches for the gaining of the Jubilee. In making Jubilee visits it is required (not *de praecepto*, but *de valore actus*, as explained above) to go into the church designated, if one can, and to say *there* the Jubilee prayers; and to do both these things with the intention of gaining the Jubilee—"cum intentione habita initio jubilaei et non retractata." If one cannot enter the church, it is required that the Jubilee prayers be said at the door of the church. But in the precept of hearing Mass there is no obligation whatever of visiting or entering a church. The precept is fulfilled even by one who stays outside when he might easily go inside, provided that whilst he is outside the church he is morally present at the Holy Sacrifice. Nor is it necessary for the fulfilment of the precept of hearing Mass that one say any prayers, either orally or mentally, although Mass affords the best opportunity for devout and effectual prayer because the prayers of those who assist at it are united with the Holy Sacrifice. Hence a priest might recite his office during a Mass of obligation; or a person after confession might say his sacramental penance just as he might say the Jubilee prayers. Finally, to fulfil the precept of hearing Mass it is not necessary to have the intention of fulfilling it; it is enough simply to perform the act or to be present at Mass. Such is the common teaching of moralists.

The difference between the two acts is, therefore, clear and covers the essential points of distinction. J. P.

THE EASTER DUTY AND THE JUBILEE.

Qu. In a diocese where the Papal Bull extending the Jubilee was promulgated on Ash Wednesday, A makes the prescribed number of

[1] *De Constit.*, p. 16.

visits during the first two weeks of Lent, and immediately after goes to confession and receives Holy Communion with the intention of gaining the Jubilee Indulgence. Either from ignorance or from neglect he fails to go to the Sacraments again until the time for the performance of the Easter duty has expired. Hence arise two questions: (1) Has A performed his Easter duty? (2) Has he gained the Jubilee? A's pastor is at a loss to decide. The words of the pastoral letter proclaiming the Jubilee seem to show that the first question must be answered in the negative; and the second in the affirmative. They run: "The Jubilee confession and Communion do not count for the annual Easter Communion." On the other hand, the words of the Papal Bull appear to favor the opposite view, for the Pope says that "the annual confession and Easter Communion will in no wise avail for gaining the Jubilee." The pastor does not know which view to take, and anxiously seeks a solution of the difficulty.

Resp. If we are to be guided by the general principles of theology, we cannot but conclude that A has performed his Easter duty, and has not gained the Jubilee. The first reason is, a reason by itself decisive of the matter, that a precept is fulfilled by the mere doing, *more humano*, of that which is enjoined, without the intention of fulfilling the precept, nay, even when the intention is positively excluded. So say all moral theologians. Nor is there anything about the precept of Paschal Communion to differentiate it in this respect from other precepts. Therefore A performed his Easter duty without knowing it, and even contrary to his intention, although he sinned afterwards from a false conscience if he failed to approach the Sacraments through culpable neglect before the time limit had expired.

Again, it is a canon of common sense, as well as a principle of moral theology, that what is matter of precept is to be attended to before that which is merely matter of devotion or of counsel. This, indeed, is commendable, but that is imperative. Hence we are to assume, unless the contrary is declared by competent authority, that the precept is first to be fulfilled. For it does not rest with the individual but with the lawgiver to say how and when the obligation of the law is to be satisfied. What the law enjoins in the present case is the receiving of Holy Communion worthily within a specified time. A is assumed to have done so,

and has consequently complied with the law irrespective of his particular intention in receiving the Sacrament.

The same conclusion is to be drawn from the words of the Bull, "ita tamen ut Confessio annualis et Sacra Communio Paschalis ad effectum lucrandi Jubilaei minime suffragentur." Some substantive force and application these words must have. Their force and application is obvious on the supposition that the Paschal Communion has to be made first, in the event of the Jubilee coinciding with the Paschal time. The Pope says in effect: "You cannot gain the Jubilee the first time you go to Communion in the season set for the fulfilment of the Easter duty. You must make a second Communion to gain the Jubilee." But on the supposition that the Jubilee may come first, it does not seem possible to give the words of the Bull any substantive application. For there are in all but three cases in which they might conceivably apply: (1) the case of one who should think to fulfil his Easter duty and gain the Jubilee by the same Communion; (2) the case of one who should intend to communicate first to gain the Jubilee and afterwards to perform the Easter duty; (3) the case of one who should intend to reverse this order. This last need not be considered, seeing that it would be manifestly superfluous for the Pope to address these words to one whose mind was, before every event, in complete accord with his own. But the words would be equally superfluous in the second case, on the supposition we have now to do with, and for precisely the same reason. In the first case, that of the one who fancies he can perform his Easter duty and gain the Jubilee by one and the same Communion, the words themselves expressly exclude the supposition in question, since they declare that the Paschal Communion does not avail to gain the Jubilee. Even supposing the Pope did but affirm that both ends could not be attained by the same Communion, in one who thinks they can and forms the twofold intention accordingly, it is, from the nature of the case, the intention of gaining the Jubilee that will be made void by the Papal declaration. For a lawgiver is rightly presumed to be solicitous before all else for the observance of his law.

So far all seems clear. But there is a response of the Peni-

tentiary Apostolic, cited by Lehmkuhl,[1] which raises a grave difficulty. Here are query and answer:

"E S. Poenitentiariae responsis certum est haud satisfieri posse praecepto paschali et jubilaeum lucrari unica confessione et Communione; potestne unus et alter attingi finis duabus Communionibus et unica confessione?

"*R.* Affirmative; firma tamen manente obligatione satisfaciendi, si nondum quis satisfecerit, praecepto *annuae* confessionis."

Now, if one can make the Jubilee confession first and put off the annual confession till some other time within the year, cannot one as well make the Jubilee Communion first and put off the Paschal Communion till some other time within the allotted period? Logically, one can; theologically, one cannot. Logically, one should be able to do so, for the two cases are perfectly parallel. If a person can go to confession for the first time within the year and make that the Jubilee confession by simply intending it to be so, he should in like manner be able to go to Communion for the first time within the Paschal season and make that the Jubilee Communion by simply intending it to be so. This seems to be the logic of it. But from the theological point of view, the case is different. The declaration of the Penitentiary is in the nature of an exception to the general rule or law. It cannot therefore be extended beyond the special case for which the exception is made and the privilege granted.

A. MACDONALD.

NON-PARISHIONERS MAKING THE JUBILEE WITH PARISH PROCESSION.

Qu. Can a person not of the parish make the Jubilee (in three visits) by going with a parish that makes it in a body?

FR. AMBROSE.

Resp. No; unless the person actually lives for the time being in the parish where the Jubilee is being made. The Pontifical Constitution promulgating the extension of the Jubilee expressly states that the privileges of a reduction of the required visits is accorded to congregations, sodalities, and bodies of the faithful making the Jubilee in procession under the leadership of *their*

[1] Vol. II, n. 549; fifth edition.

respective pastors or assistants deputed by them. "Christifidelibus *cum proprio parocho* aut alio sacerdote ab eo deputato, statutas ecclesias processionaliter visitantibus, easdem visitationes ad minorem numerum reducendi."

REPETITION OF THE JUBILEE FOR THE SOULS IN PURGATORY.

The question whether the Jubilee Indulgence of the present year may be gained more than once so as to be applied to the souls in purgatory has been agitated in many places. By a decision of the Penitentiary Apostolic of May 10, 1900, the Jubilee Indulgence of the Holy Year could be repeated in Rome for the benefit of the suffering souls. But it does not follow that this interpretation of the privilege applies to the present extension of the Jubilee.

According to a general rule, no indulgence may be applied to the souls in purgatory, unless it is so specified in the terms of the concession. Such a concession was made, as stated above, by the Penitentiary for the Jubilee of last year. The Bull of Extension, on the other hand, uses the words, "vere poenitentibus et confessis, sacraque Communione refectis, plenissimam peccatorum suorum indulgentiam, remissionem et veniam misericorditer in Domino *semel* concedimus et impertimus." The term *semel* allows no wider interpretation.

It might be urged that the fact of the Penitentiary admitting a repetition of the Jubilee Indulgence last year for Rome, implies a like admission for the present extension of the Jubilee, even without the express mention of it, on the principle of *favores ampliandi*. But there is a difference between the Jubilee of last year and its extension at present. Last year all (except a few specified indulgences *pro vivis*) were suspended. The object was to induce a greater eagerness on the part of the faithful to avail themselves of the one great Jubilee Indulgence by going to Rome. That particular object, of bringing the faithful to visit the sanctuaries of the Holy City, has ceased. The faithful can gain during this year not only the Jubilee Indulgence, but also all other indulgences as usual for themselves. They can also apply numerous indulgences, as at other times, for the suffering souls. The ostensible reason,

therefore, which permitted the repetition of the Jubilee in Rome, no longer avails, and the extension allows the gaining of the Indulgence but once for those capable of performing the prescribed visits or the works imposed on them by the confessor who has the faculty of commuting the visits.

To make sure that this interpretation is correct, the Editor of the REVIEW applied to Rome for a decision of the question, and in reply received a cablegram, stating that the Indulgence of the Jubilee extension could be gained *only once*, as set forth in the terms of the Bull. Possibly, a special concession might be made hereafter, which would render the Indulgence applicable to the souls of the departed in purgatory; but such is not the interpretation of the Pontifical Constitution in its present form.

INTENTION OF ADULTS FOR VALID BAPTISM.

Qu. Allow me to submit the following case to your kind consideration.

A girl at the age of thirteen years went through the ceremony of baptism in a Protestant church. She is now twenty-six years of age, and she avers: "I did not know, when I was baptized, what it was for." She went to the church and permitted the ceremony, of her own free will.

According to Sabetti it is a common opinion of the theologians that in the baptism of adults the valid reception of the Sacrament must be accompanied by at least an *intentio habitualis;* others say that a "*voluntas implicita* peragendi omnia ad salutem necessaria" suffices. In this case the former would be the more acceptable opinion. But could the *intentio habitualis* have existed, without the knowledge of the meaning of the Sacrament? In other words, is the knowledge of the meaning of the Sacrament of Baptism necessary for the intention that is required in an adult for its valid reception?

I shall be grateful for your view, as will also others who are interested in the case. J. S. M.

Resp. The intention in an adult for the valid reception of the Sacrament of Baptism need indeed be but an *intentio habitualis implicita;* but such intention supposes a knowledge of the essential characteristics of the sacramental purpose or act, viz., in this case,

its necessity for salvation as absolvent of sin. Ignorance of what the ceremony is for is equivalent to an absence of this essential knowledge. Theologians, like Noldin, put the matter, therefore, in the right form when they say: "Si quis ignorans quid sit sacramentum, mere materialiter id sibi conferri permittat, illud non accipit."[1] Hence the convert should be rebaptized conditionally, for it is to be presumed that at the age of thirteen years the girl, being of ordinary intelligence, was capable of such instruction as would elicit the required intention for the valid reception of the Sacrament of Baptism. The fact that she did "not know what it was for" is evidence that there was not the coöperation of the understanding and will which is necessary for definite responsible actions, and without which the sacramental effect cannot reach the soul capable of eliciting proper motives for its responsible actions. Before the age of reason the child's necessary dependence places the responsibility for its actions upon those who supply the motive. After the age of reason has been attained, the child can supply its own motives and becomes proportionately responsible.

THE VEIL BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT DURING SERMONS.

Qu. Is it obligatory by rubrical law to place before the Blessed Sacrament exposed for adoration a veil or banner whilst the sermon is being preached at Mass or during the Forty Hours' Prayer?

Resp. There is no rubric to this effect; but a decision of the S. Congregation of Rites, in reply to the question: Whether or not, when the Mass is celebrated before the Blessed Sacrament exposed, a sermon (not necessarily on the Blessed Sacrament) may be preached at the Gospel? enjoins the use of the veil during sermons before the Blessed Sacrament. "Num tolerari possit consuetudo exponendi SS. Sacramentum et coram eo missam celebrandi in qua fit post evangelium praedicatio verbi Dei?—*Affirmative;* apposito tamen velamine ante SS. Eucharistiam dum habetur concio."[2]

[1] *De Sacramentis*, n. 40, 3, c.

[2] S. Rit. Cong., May 10, 1890, num. 3728.

LORD RUSSELL IN THE "ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW."

The English secular press brings appreciative notices of the Memories and Letters by the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J., which appeared in the March issue of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. The London *News* prints in full five of the Letters, adding:

> "There are other striking letters in the article, but those chosen for presentation here show aspects unsuspected by the world, and therefore all the more interesting to those who knew their writer only, to use Lord Dufferin's words, as 'the man whose great talents, whose brilliant career at the Bar, whose distinguished services as a statesman in Parliament, and, above all, whose blameless reputation and lofty character had advanced him to the august position of Lord Chief Justice of England.'"

Equally favorable comments are received about Father Sheehan's Serials. Thus the London *Spectator* recognizes the writer's exceptional power, saying that his writing is marked "by a width of culture, and distinguished by an eloquence and charm of style, which greatly enhance the intrinsic merit" of the story.

We note these comments with pleasure as a recognition by competent critics of the fact that the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW presents to its readers the best in letters as well as in the science of theology and pastorals, which is its special domain.

THE SECOND MASS FOR MEMBERS OF CLERICAL UNIONS.

Qu. The Yorkshire Clergy Brethren Fund is an association of the secular clergy of the two Yorkshire dioceses, Leeds and Middlesbrough, for the support of aged and infirm priests who are no longer able to do missionary work.

Each priest who becomes a member of the Fund contributes ten pounds. The society is maintained by these contributions together with donations from charitable persons. Each benefactor contributing ten pounds is entitled to have forty Masses offered for his intentions, either at once or at decease. These Masses are said by the priests who are members of the Fund, who are also obliged to say one Mass every month for the living and deceased benefactors of the Fund.

The question I wish to ask is: Can these Masses for benefactors be said by the priests as their second Mass on Sundays or other days when duplication is allowed or necessary?

This question has been much discussed, and opinions are still divided. I have heard it stated that you have already dealt with it

in the REVIEW. I have looked over the published volumes since 1893 and can find no mention of it. I should be grateful for your views on the matter. WILL. J. MCNAUGHTON.

England.

Resp. The S. Congregation of the Council has decided that the second Mass of a priest who has to duplicate, may be offered to satisfy the obligation attached to clerical confraternities whose members pledge themselves to offer the Holy Sacrifice for each other. The reason is obvious. The obligation, although strictly binding after the compact is made, is one that rests primarily on a motive of mutual charity. This would appear to be true even if the deceased contributors are regarded in the light of benefactors who expect to have a number of Masses said. Hence the manner of fulfilling the obligation by offering the Mass as above stated does not seem to conflict in principle with the discipline of the Church intended to guard against the danger of making the sacred office an occasion for avarice. This is under the supposition that the priests are not recipients of a money stipend for the Masses they say, apart from the title arising out of this membership. The question proposed to the Holy See was:

"An sacerdos, qui ex statutis sodalitatis cui nomen dedit, tenetur Missam celebrare pro sodali defuncto, possit ad satisfaciendum huic oneri secundam missam in die binationis applicare in casu."

The answer was:

"*Affirmative:* sacerdotem qui binat, posse secundam missam applicare pro sodali erga quem tenetur ex lege caritatis potius quam ex lege justitiae; quia hac concessione integra manet ecclesiae disciplina quae non sinit pro secunda missa eleemosynam accipere."

(S. C. C., March 21, 1887; Vivarien.; *Act. S. Sed.* XI, 283.)

IS TYPEWRITING FORBIDDEN ON SUNDAYS?

Qu. Would you kindly inform some of your readers who hold different views with regard to typewriting on Sundays, what you consider the law of the Church on the subject? Is it lawful for a typewriter to work at the instrument for, say, an hour or more on Sundays?

I know you justly object to answering questions that are to be

found in any theological work on morals, but as far as I know the above is a subject that has not been discussed in our manuals of theology.

Resp. The precept of the Church which incorporates the Mosaic Law to "keep the Sabbath holy" does not specify the occupations that are forbidden on Sundays and holydays. It prohibits servile work. That which gives to certain work the characteristic of being servile is partly derived from the nature of the work (the habitual occupation of servants, laborers, etc.), and partly from the circumstances under which the work is performed. To carry heavy lumber is ordinarily considered a laborious occupation, forbidden on Sundays; but if a man lifted up an oaken post because he wished to try his strength we should not charge him with breaking the Sabbath. So on the other hand there are occupations like sewing or painting which, although not in their nature servile, and therefore not forbidden, nevertheless might violate the Sunday precept if performed under certain circumstances. Such is the case of tailors and sign-painters who make of these occupations a regular avocation. These persons could not be excused from a violation of the Sunday precept.

The same is to be said of typewriting. It is not the occupation itself that constitutes the violation of the law, but the circumstances which give to the work in the common estimation the character of a wage-earner's task. The performance of such tasks would turn the sacred day into a day of labor (whether much or little work be done) like the ordinary week-day.

Good sense must determine in this case whether the use of the typewriter is a mere diversion (or a necessity), and therefore licit on Sunday, or whether from the circumstances it takes on the nature of a servile occupation, such as the law of Sunday rest and devotion forbids.

RAILWAY CHAPELS.

For some years past there have been in use in the Western States so-called chapel-cars, which are rented for religious services on Sundays and can be easily transformed to accommodate the needs of different missions. We take the following description of these cars from a Chicago journal.

"They are made after the pattern of an ordinary railroad car, only on a larger scale, and are provided with sufficient space to seat one hundred people comfortably, and to give room for the church organ and pulpit, besides providing for living quarters for the missionary and his family. They travel from town to town, staying five or six weeks in each place. It is rare that they are not the forerunners of a permanent church home and the basis of the religious and social sentiment of the places visited by them. There are now eight of the railroad chapel-cars travelling in the Western States and in the pineries and woods of Northern Wisconsin and Minnesota. They are all made of the best material and workmanship. They are 80 feet long from end to end, having a 70-foot body. This space is divided into a 50-foot chapel, with seats provided for 100 people. At one end 20 feet of the length of the car is set apart for the use of the evangelist and his family. They are never allowed to get out of repair, but are sent to the shop to receive a coat of paint and varnish whenever needed. They are fitted with six-wheel trucks and air brakes. The cost of the cars is $7,000 each. The railroad companies have become interested in the movement, and the cars are hauled from place to place free of charge. The first car that was built was given the name of 'Evangel.' Other names that have been provided are 'Glad Tidings,' 'Messenger of Peace,' or they have been named in the order of their erection, as 'Chapel-car No. 3.'"

We fancy it would be a convenience for many pastors who have missions on the railroad, if they could own their chapel-cars. It would probably be an easy matter to arrange for regular transportation on Sundays when traffic on the roads is less frequent than during the week. Thus two or more small communities could be brought together and a good deal of personal inconvenience would be spared to the individual who has to drive or walk long distances.

THE MISSAL AT THE CLOSING OF MASS.

Qu. An ordinance of the archdiocese of Montreal, issued by the late Archbishop, obliges the celebrant after reading the last Gospel from the missal to close the latter with the right hand (so that when closed the edge or front is turned away from the tabernacle), and then to turn the missal completely over so that finally the edge is next to the tabernacle. Will you kindly inform me if there is any ruling from Rome to authorize the latter part of this practice?

M. C.

Resp. There is no rubric or any Roman ruling on the subject of closing the missal. Liturgical writers suggest special (symbolical) motives for turning the missal with its opening side towards the tabernacle. Thus de Herdt says: "Pars qua aperitur